THE
Second Part
OF THE
PRESERVATIVE
AGAINST
POPERY.

Imprimatur Liber cui Titulus,

The Second Part of the Preservative against Popery.

May 3. 1688.

Guil. Needham, R. R.
in Christo P. ac D.D.
Willelmo Archiepisc.
Cant. à Sacr. Domest.

The Second Part OF THE Preſervative AGAINST POPERY:

Shewing how Contrary *POPERY is to the True Ends* OF THE **Chriſtian Religion.**

Fitted for the INSTRUCTION OF *Unlearned PROTESTANTS.*

By *WILLIAM SHERLOCK*, D. D.
Maſter of the *Temple.*

LONDON:
Printed for *William Rogers*, at the *Sun* over againſt St. *Dunſtan's* Church in *Fleet-ſtreet.*
M DC LXXXVIII.

THE PRESERVATIVE AGAINST POPERY.

CHAP. IV.

Some Directions relating to particular Controverſies.

THoſe who would underſtand the particular Diſputes between us and the Church of *Rome*, muſt of neceſſity read ſuch Books as give the true State of the Controverſie between us, and fairly repreſent the Arguments on both ſides; and where ſuch Books are to be met with, he may learn from a late Letter, Entituled, *The Preſent State of the Controverſie between the Church of* England *and the Church of* Rome, *Or an Account of Books written on both ſides.* But my preſent Deſign is of another nature, to give ſome plain and eaſie Marks and Characters of true Goſpel Doctrines; whereby a man, who has any reliſh of the true Spirit of Chriſtianity, may as certainly know Truth from Error in many caſes, as the Palate can diſtinguiſh Taſts. There are ſome things ſo proper to the Goſpel, and ſo primarily intended in it, that they may fitly ſerve for diſtinguiſhing marks of true Evangelical Doctrine: I ſhall name ſome of the chief, and Examine ſome Popiſh Doctrines by them.

SECTION

SECTION I.

Concerning IDOLATRY.

1. ONE principal intention of the Goſpel, was more perfectly to extirpate all Idolatry; *For this purpoſe the ſon of God was manifeſted to deſtroy the works of the devil,* that is, not only all Sin and Wickedneſs, but the very Kingdom of Darkneſs; that Kingdom the Devil had erected in the world, the very Foundation of which was laid in Idolatrous Worſhip.

1 John 3. 8.

To this purpoſe Chriſt has expreſly taught us, that there is but one God, and has more perfectly inſtructed us in the nature of God: *For no man hath ſeen God at any time, but the only begotten ſon, who is in the boſom of the father, he hath declared him.* Ignorance was the Mother of Pagan Idolatry, becauſe they did not know the true God, they Worſhipped any thing, every thing, for a God; and therefore the moſt effectual courſe to cure Idolatry, was to make known the true God to the world: for thoſe men are inexcuſable who know the true God, and Worſhip any thing elſe. Tho' indeed according to ſome mens Divinity, the knowledge of the true God cures Idolatry, not by rooting out Idolatrous Worſhip, but by excuſing it; by making that to be no Idolatry in a Chriſtian, who knows God, which was Idolatry in a Heathen, who did not know him: for if (as ſome ſay) none can be guilty of Idolatry, who acknowledge one Supream Being; then the Heathens, when once they were inſtructed in the knowledge of the one true God, might have Worſhipped all their Country Gods, which they did before, without being guilty of Idolatry; which is, as if I ſhould ſay, that man is a Rebel, who through miſtake and ignorance owns any man for his Prince, who is not his Prince; but he, is no Rebel, who knows his lawful Prince, and pays Homage to another, whom he knows not to be his Prince.

1. Joh. 18.

And therefore our Saviour confines all Religious Worſhip to God alone: *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve:* It is his Anſwer to the Devil, when he tempt-

Mat. 10.

ed

ed him to fall down and worſhip him, but he gives ſuch an anſwer as excludes all Creatures, not only bad but good Spirits, from any ſhare in Religious Worſhip: Our Saviour does not deny to worſhip him meerly becauſe he was the Devil, (tho' that a man may do without the guilt of Idolatry, who knows him to be the Devil, if thoſe men are in the right, who allow nothing to be Idolatry, but to worſhip ſome Being for the Supreme God, who is not Supreme; for then you may worſhip the Devil without the guilt of Idolatry, if you do not believe him to be the Supreme God) but our Saviour's reaſon for not worſhipping him was, becauſe we muſt Worſhip none but God. Which is as good a reaſon againſt the worſhip of the moſt glorious Angel, as of the Devil himſelf: Nay, our Saviour denies to worſhip him, though the Devil made no terms with him, about the kind or degrees of Worſhip: He does not require him to offer Sacrifice to him, (which is the only Act of Worſhip the Church of *Rome* appropriates to the Supreme God) but only to bow down before him, as an expreſſion of Religious Devotion; he did not demand that degree of Worſhip, which the Church of *Rome* calls *Latria*, and appropriates to the Supreme God: nay, he confeſſes that he was not the Supreme God, for he does not pretend to diſpoſe of the Kingdoms of the World in his own right, but ſays, they were given to him, and he had power to give them to whom he pleaſed; in which he acknowledges, that he had a Superiour, and therefore could not in the ſame breath deſire to be owned and worſhipped as the Supreme. But our Saviour denies to give him this inferiour degree of Worſhip, and thereby teaches us, that no degree of Religious Worſhip muſt be given to any Being, but the Supreme God.

And becauſe Mankind were very apt to worſhip inferiour Dæmons, as believing them to have the care of this lower World, and that it was in their power to do great good to them, to anſwer their Prayers, and to mediate for them with the Superiour Deities, or with the Supreme God, if they believed one Supreme, which appears to be a received Notion among them: to prevent this kind of Idolatry, God advances his own Son to be the univerſal

verſal Mediator, and the Supreme and Soveraign Lord of the World; that all Mankind ſhould make their Addreſſes and Applications to him, and offer up their Prayers only in his Name; that in him they ſhould find acceptance, and in no other name. Which was the moſt effectual way to put an end to the Worſhip of all inferiour Deities, and Creature-Patrons and Advocates; for when we are aſſured, that no other Being can Mediate for us with effect and power, but only Chriſt, it is natural to Worſhip no other Mediator but him, who being the eternal Son of God, may be worſhipped without danger of Idolatry. Thus St. *Paul* tells us, That tho' the Heathen world had *Gods many and Lords many*, yet to us there is but *one God the Father*, and *one Lord Jeſus Chriſt*: One Supreme and Soveraign Deity, and one Mediator between God and men.

1 Cor. 8. 5, 6.

Now this being ſo apparently one end of Chriſt's coming into the World to Suppreſs the Idolatry of Creature-Worſhip, and to confine all Religious worſhip to one Supreme Being, in oppoſition to the many Gods of the Heathens, and to teach us to make our Applications to this one God by one Mediator, in oppoſition to the worſhip of inferiour Deities; can any man imagine, that the worſhip of Saints and Angels, and the Virgin *Mary*, can be any part of the Chriſtian Religion? For how dear ſoever they are to God, they are but his Creatures, and if Soveraign Princes will not receive their greateſt Favourites into their Throne, much leſs will God.

If God under the Goſpel diſpenſation has taken care to prevent the Worſhip of inferiour Beings, by appointing his own Son to be our only Mediator and Advocate, can we imagine, that he ever intended we ſhould offer up our Prayers to other Mediators? If he had liked the Mediation of Creatures, would he have given his own Son to be our Prieſt and our Mediator? Whatever fair pretences may be made for this, it apparently contradicts the Goſpel-diſpenſation; for if we muſt own but one God, he alone muſt be worſhipped; if we have but one Mediator, we muſt offer up our Prayers only in his Name and Interceſſion. The Religious Worſhip of Creatures is Idolatry, and if God intended to

root

root Idolatry out of the World, by the Goſpel of Chriſt, he could never intend to ſet up the Worſhip of Saints, and the Virgin *Mary*, which tho' it have not all the aggravations of Pagan Idolatry, yet is Creature-worſhip.

Thus we know, how fond the Heathens were of material Images and Pictures, to repreſent their Gods as viſibly preſent with them; and to receive Religious Worſhip in their ſtead: not that they did believe their Gods to be Corporeal, or that their Corporeal Images were proper Likeneſſes of their Gods, in which a late Author places the whole of Idolatry, which I confeſs was agreeable enough to his deſign, to find out ſuch a Notion of Idolatry, as it may be no Perſons in the World were ever guilty of, and then he might excuſe, whom he pleaſed from Idolatry: But the Heathens were not ſuch great Sots, as this account makes them, as the Learned *Founder of all Anti-Catholick, and Anti-chriſtian Principles* (as this Author is pleaſed to ſtile a very great man, whoſe Name will be Venerable to future Ages) has abundantly proved. But they wanted ſome material Repreſentations of their Gods, in which they might as it were ſee them preſent, and offer up their Petitions to them, and court them with ſome viſible and ſenſible Honours. Now to cure this Idolatry, tho' God would not allow any Images or Pictures for Worſhip, yet by the Law of *Moſes* he appoints them to build an Houſe or Temple for himſelf, where he would dwell among them, and place the Symbols of his Preſence; there was the Mercy-ſeat, and the Cherubims covering the Mercy-ſeat, and there God promiſed *Moſes to meet with him, and to commune* with him *from between the two Cherubims, which are upon the ark of the teſtimony.* Now this was a Symbolical Repreſentation of God's Throne in Heaven, where he is ſurrounded with Angels, as we know, the Holy of Holies itſelf was a Figure of Heaven; and therefore the *Jews*, when they were abſent from the Temple, prayed towards it, and in the Temple (as is thought) towards the Mercy-ſeat, as the place of God's peculiar Reſidence; as now when we pray, we liſt up our eyes and hands to Heaven, where God dwells: So that under the Law God had a peculiar place for Worſhip, and peculi-

Dr. *Stillin.* Defence of the Diſcourſe concerning Idolatry.

25 Exod. 22.

ar Symbols of his Preſence, but no Images to repreſent his Perſon, or to be the Objects of Worſhip: I know ſome *Roman* Doctors would fain prove the Cherubims to have been the Objects of Worſhip, and which is more wonderful, a late Biſhop of the Church of *England* has taken ſome pains to prove the ſame, and thereby to juſtifie the Worſhip of Images in the Church of *Rome*; and before I proceed, I ſhall briefly Examine what he has ſaid in this Cauſe.

Reaſons for abrogating the Teſt. p. 124, &c.

One would a little wonder, who reads the Second Commandment, which ſo ſeverely forbids the Worſhip of Images, that God himſelf ſhould ſet up Images in his own Temple as the Objects of Worſhip; and a modeſt man would have been a little cautious, how he had imputed ſuch a thing to God, which is ſo direct a contradiction to his own Laws. That the Cherubims were *Statues or Images, whatever their particular Form was*, I agree with our Author, and that is the only thing I agree with him in: For,

1. That *they were Sacred Images ſet up by God himſelf, in the place of his own Worſhip*, I deny. For the Holy of Holies, where the Ark was placed, and the Mercy-ſeat over the Ark, and the Cherubims at the two ends ſpreading their Wings, and covering the Mercy-ſeat, was not the place of Worſhip, but the place of God's Preſence. The place of Worſhip is the place wherein men worſhip God; now it is ſufficiently known, that none of the *Jews* were permitted to go into the Holy of Holies, nor ſo much as to look into it, and therefore it could not be the place of their Worſhip: the Holy of Holies was the Figure of Heaven, and therefore could be no more the place of Worſhip to the *Jews*, than Heaven now is to us, while we dwell on Earth. The High Prieſt indeed entered into the Holy of Holies once a year, with the Blood of the Sacrifice, which was a Type of Chriſt's entring into Heaven with his own Blood, and yet the Prieſt went thither not to Worſhip, but to make an Atonement; which I take to be two very different things; however if you will call this Worſhip, it has no relation to any Worſhip on Earth, but to what is done by Chriſt in Heaven, of whom the High Prieſt was a Type. And this,

Ibid. p. 127.

9 Heb. 21, 22.

this, I think, is a demonſtration, that the placing of Cherubims to cover the Mercy-ſeat in the Holy of Holies, does not prove the lawful uſe of Images in Temples or Churches, or in the Worſhip of God on Earth; if it proves any thing, it muſt prove the Worſhip of God by Images in Heaven, of which the Holy of Holies was a Figure; and if any man can be ſo fooliſh as to imagine that, let them make what they pleaſe of it, ſo they do but excuſe us from worſhipping God by Images on Earth.

2. That theſe Cherubims *were the moſt ſolemn and ſacred part of the Jewiſh Religion; that nothing is more remarkable in all the old Teſtament, than the honour done to the Cherubims,* that an *outward worſhip was given to theſe Images, as Symbols of the Divine preſence,* that *the High Prieſt adored theſe Cherubims once a year,* as this Author aſſerts, I utterly deny; and he has not given us one word to prove it.

For the Cherubims were ſo far from being the moſt ſolemn and ſacred part of the Jewiſh Religion, that they were no part at all of it, if by Religion he means Worſhip; for there was no regard at all had to the Cherubims in the Jewiſh Worſhip; and it is ſo far from being *remarkable in the Old Teſtament,* that there is not the leaſt footſtep or intimation of any honour at all done to the Cherubims: There is nothing in Scripture concerning them, but the command to make them, and place them at the two ends of the Mercy-Seat; and that God is ſaid to dwell between the Cherubims, and to give forth his Oracles and Reſponſes from that place: but I deſire to learn, where the Jews are commanded to direct their Worſhip to or towards the Cherubims? where the High Prieſt is commanded to adore the Cherubims once a year? or what Proteſtant grants he did ſo, as this Author inſinuates?

He ſuppoſes the Cherubims to have been *the Symbols of Gods preſence,* and his *repreſentations*, and that the Jews directed their worſhip to them as ſuch, *and that is to worſhip God by Images, or to give the ſame Signs of Reverence to his Repreſentations, as to himſelf:* but how does it appear, that the Cherubims were the Symbols of Gods preſence? God indeed is ſaid to ſit between the Cherubims, and he promiſed *Moſes* to commune with him from P. 130.

between the Cherubims, but the Cherubims were no Symbols of Gods preſence, much leſs a repreſentation of him: if any thing was the Symbolical preſence of God, it was the Mercy Seat, which was a kind of Figurative Throne, or Chair of State; but the Cherubims were only Symbolical repreſentations of thoſe Angels, who attend and encompaſs Gods Throne in Heaven, and were no more repreſentations of God, or Symbols of his preſence, then ſome great Miniſters of State are of the King; as this Author himſelf acknowledges, when he makes *the four beaſts* in the Revelations (*Rev.* 4. 6,7.) *which ſtood round about the Throne*, to be an *alluſion to the repreſentation of the immediate Divine Preſence in the Ark by the Cherubims*; if he had ſaid to the Cherubims covering the Mercy Seat, which was his Figurative Throne, and where he was inviſibly preſent, without any viſible Figures or Symbols of his preſence, he had ſaid right: for the Cherubims which covered the Mercy Seat, were no more Symbols of Gods Preſence, than the four Beaſts, which ſtood before the Throne, are the preſence of God; or then ſome great Courtiers or Miniſters of State, who attend the King, are the preſence of the King; They attend the King, where ever he is, and ſo may be ſome ſign of his preſence, but are not a ſymbolical preſence, as a Chair of State is. But it ſeems our Author imagined, that the Cherubims were ſuch Symbols of Gods preſence, and ſuch repreſentations of him, as Images were of the Pagan Gods, and therefore might be worſhipped with the ſame ſigns of reverence, as God himſelf was; according to *Thomas Aquinas*'s Rule, that the Image muſt be worſhipped with the ſame Worſhip, which is due to the Proto-type, or that Being whoſe Image it is, which is ſuch old Popery, as Monſieur *De Meaux*, and the Repreſenter cry ſhame of; well, But how does he prove, that any Worſhip was directed to theſe Cherubims? I can find no proof he offers for it, but *David's Exhortation* (as he calls it) *to the People, to honour the Ark* (he ſhould have ſaid worſhip) προσκυνεῖτε, *bow down to, or worſhip his Footſtool, for it, or he, is holy.* Now ſuppoſe this did relate to the Ark, What is that to the Cherubims? When but four Pages before, he tells us, that *the Ark is called God's Footſtool, and the*

Page 127.

Page 130.

Che-

Cherubims his Throne; How then does *David*'s Exhortation to worſhip the Ark, which is God's Footſtool, prove that all their Worſhip, muſt be directed to the Cherubims, which are his Throne? It is pitty, that great Wits have but ſhort Memories.

And yet I fancy, our Author would have been much troubled to prove the Ark to be meant by God's Footſtool; for the Ark was in the Holy of Holies, which was a figure of Heaven; and neither the Heaven, nor any thing in it, but the Earth, is in Scripture called God's Foot-ſtool; and the Pſalmiſt expreſly applies it to *Zion*, and to the *Holy Hill*, which, I will not prove, was not the Ark. 99 Pſalm 2, 9.

And this I ſuppoſe is a ſufficient confutation of his Expoſition of the words, *To bow down to, or worſhip his foot-ſtool*; for I believe he did not think that Mount *Zion*, or the Holy Hill, was the object of worſhip, or the ſymbol of God's preſence; but there God was preſent, and that was reaſon enough to worſhip *at his foot-ſtool, and at his holy hill*; as our *Engliſh* Tranſlation reads it.

But now ſuppoſe the *Jews* were to direct their Worſhip towards the Mercy-ſeat, which was covered with the Cherubims, where God had promiſed to be preſent; how are the Cherubims concerned in this Worſhip? The worſhip was paid only to God, though directed to God, as peculiarly preſent at that place; which is no more, than to lift up our Eyes and Hands to Heaven, where the Throne of God is, when we pray to him: I grant, that *bowing to*, and *bowing towards* any thing, as the Object of Worſhip, is the very ſame, as this Author obſerves; and therefore had the *Jews* either bowed *to* or *towards* the Cherubims, as the Objects of their Worſhip, as the Papiſts bow *to* or *towards* their Images, they had been equally guilty of Idolatry, and the breach of the ſecond Commandment; but when bowing *To* ſignifies bowing to an object of Worſhip, and bowing *towards* ſignifies bowing to this Object of Worſhip, only *towards* ſuch a place, where he is peculiarly preſent, this makes a great difference; and this was all the *Jews* did at moſt, if they did that; they bowed to God towards the Mercy-ſeat, where he dwelt, without any regard to the Cherubims or Mercy-ſeat, as the Object of Worſhip,

ſhip, which was as inviſible to the *Jews* then, as the Throne of God and the Angels in Heaven are now to us; and we may as well ſay, that thoſe who lift up their eyes and their hands to Heaven, when they pray to God, worſhip the Angels, who incircle his Throne, becauſe they know that the Angels are there; as ſay, that the *Jews* worſhipped their inviſible Cherubims, becauſe they knew that the Cherubims were there: For is there any neceſſity that the *Jews* muſt worſhip whatever they knew, was in the Holy of Holies, becauſe they worſhipped God towards that place, any more than there is, that we muſt worſhip whatever we know to be in Heaven, when we direct our Worſhip to God in Heaven?

Men, I grant, may worſhip an unſeen Object, for ſo we all worſhip God, whom we do not and cannot ſee; but it is a good argument ſtill, that the Cherubims were not intended by God for the Objects of Worſhip, becauſe they were concealed from the Peoples ſight; for I believe the World never heard before of worſhipping inviſible Images: The original intention of Images, is to have a viſible Object of Worſhip; for an inviſible Image can affect us no more than an inviſible God; and if our Author had conſulted all the Patrons of Image-worſhip, whether Pagan or Popiſh, he would have found moſt of the reaſons they alleadge for this Worſhip to depend on ſight, and therefore whatever he thought, are all loſt when a man ſhuts his eyes. A man who directs his worſhip to an Image, may be an Idolater in the dark, and with his eyes ſhut; but as blind as Idolaters are, there never had been any Image-worſhip, had their Images been as inviſible as their Gods; and therefore ſight has more to do in this matter, than our Author was aware of.

But it ſeems the High-Prieſt once a Year did ſee theſe Cherubims, and adore and worſhip them. But this is another miſtake: for the *Jews* did believe, that the High-Prieſt never ſaw the Cherubims or Mercy-ſeat, even when he went once a Year into the Holy of Holies; and they have great reaſon for what they ſay, ſince God expreſly commanded, That when he went into the Holy of Holies, he ſhould take *a cenſer full of burning coals of fire from off the altar before the Lord, and his hands full of ſweet*

ſweet incenſe beaten ſmall, and bring it within the veil: And he ſhall put the incenſe upon the fire before the Lord, that the cloud of the incenſe may cover the mercy-ſeat, that is upon the teſtimony, that he die not, 16. Levit. 12, 13. which ſhews that the Cherubims and Mercy-ſeat were to be covered with a Cloud of Ineenſe, and to become as inviſible to the High-Prieſt within the Veil, as to the People without it.

But ſuppoſe the High-Prieſt did ſee the Cherubims, when he entred within the Veil, I have one plain Argument to prove that he did not worſhip them, not only becauſe no act of Worſhip was commanded him when he went into the Holy Place, but becauſe as the Holy of Holies was the figure of Heaven, and the Cherubims the types of Angels, who ſtand about the Throne of God; ſo the High-Prieſt entring into the Holy of Holies, was the type of Chriſt aſcending into Heaven with his own Bloud; and therefore the High-Prieſt muſt do nothing in the Holy of Holies, but what was a proper figure and type of what Chriſt does in Heaven: and then he muſt no more worſhip the Cherubims, which covered the Mercy-ſeat, or the Typical Throne of God, than Chriſt himſelf, when he aſcended to Heaven, was to worſhip the Angels, who ſtand about the Throne.

So that notwithſtanding God's command to make two Cherubims, and to place them at the two ends of the Mercy-ſeat in the Holy of Holies, all Image-Worſhip was ſtrictly forbid by the Law of *Moſes*; and God has provided the moſt effectual remedy againſt it by the Incarnation of his Son: Mankind have been always fond of ſome viſible Deity, and becauſe God cannot be ſeen, they have gratified their Superſtition by making ſome viſible Images and Repreſentations of an inviſible God: now to take them off from mean corporeal Images and Repreſentations, which are both a diſhonour to the Divine Nature, and debaſe the minds of men, God has given us a viſible Image of Himſelf, has cloathed his own eternal Son with Humane Nature, who is *the brightneſs of his* Father's *glory, and the expreſs image of his perſon*, 1. Hebr. 3. And therefore St. *John* tells us, That *the word was made fleſh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glo-*

ry

ry as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth, 1 John 14. And for this reaſon when *Philip* was deſirous to ſee the Father, *Shew us the Father and it ſufficeth*; Chriſt tells him, that the Father is to be ſeen onely in the Son, who is his viſible Image and Glory; *Jeſus ſaith unto him, Have I been ſo long time with you, and yet haſt thou not ſeen me Philip? He that hath ſeen me, hath ſeen the Father, and how ſayeſt thou then, Shew us the Father?* 14 John 8, 9. This was one end of Chriſt's Incarnation, that we might have a viſible Deity, a God Incarnate to repreſent the Father to us, who is the living and viſible Image of God; and there could not be a more effectual way to make men deſpiſe all dead material Repreſentations of God, than to have God viſibly repreſented to us in our own Nature.

It is true, Chriſt is not viſible to us now on earth, but he is viſible in Heaven, and we know, he is the only viſible Image of God, and that is enough to teach us, that we muſt make and adore no other. He is as viſible to us in Heaven, as the Mercy Seat in the Holy of Holies was to the Jews, and is that true propitiatory of which the mercy ſeat was a Type and Figure, 3 *Rom.* 25. *Him hath God ſet forth to be a propitiation through Faith in his blood* ἱλαστήριον the Mercy-ſeat, as that word is uſed, 9 *Heb.* 5. He is the natural Image of God, and his Mercy-ſeat, or Preſence and Throne of Grace, he is his viſible Image, tho' he cannot be ſeen by us, for the Typical Mercy Seat in the Holy of Holies, did præfigure, that his reſidence ſhould be in Heaven, and therefore inviſible to us on earth, but there we may ſee him by Faith, and there he will receive our Prayers, and preſent them to his Father.

Now then to ſum up this Argument: ſince it was one main deſign of Chriſts appearance, to root all the remains of Idolatrous Worſhip out of the world, is it credible, that the Worſhip of Saints and Angels, and the Virgin *Mary*; the worſhip of Images and Reliques, as it is practiſed in the Church of *Rome*, ſhould be any part of Chriſtian Worſhip, or allowed by the Goſpel of our Saviour? If Creature-worſhip, and Image-worſhip were ſo offenſive to God, here is the Worſhip of Creatures, and Images ſtill, and therefore all the viſible Idolatry, that ever was practiſed in

in the world before: All that they can pretend is, that they have better Notions of the Worſhip of Saints, and Angels, and Images, than the Heathens had: but whether they have or no, will be hard to prove: The Pagan Philoſophers made the ſame Apologies for their Worſhip of Angels, and Dæmons, and Images, which the Learned Papiſts now make, and whether unlearned Papiſts have not as groſs Notions about their Worſhip of Saints and Images, as the unlearned Heathens had, is very doubtful, and has been very much ſuſpected by learned Romaniſts themſelves: But ſuppoſe there were ſome difference upon this account, can we think, that Chriſt, who came to root out all Idolatrous Worſhip, intended to ſet up a new kind of Creature-Worſhip and Image-Worſhip in greater pomp and glory than ever, and only to rectifie mens Opinions about it? Suppoſe the Idolatry of Creature-Worſhip and Image-Worſhip, does conſiſt onely in mens groſs Notions about it; yet we ſee under the Law to prevent and cure this, God did not go about to rectifie their Opinions of theſe things, but abſolutely forbids the Worſhip of all Images, and of any other Being but himſelf, which methinks he would not have done, had there been ſuch great advantages in the Worſhip of Saints, and Angels, and Images, as the Romaniſts pretend: and when God in the Law of *Moſes* forbad all Creature and Image-Worſhip, can we think, that Chriſt who came to make a more perfect Reformation, ſhould only change their Country Gods into Saints and Angels, and the Virgin *Mary*, and give new names to their Statues and Images? Which whatever he had taught about it, inſtead of curing Idolatry, had been to ſet up that ſame kind of Worſhip, which the Law of *Moſes* abſolutely forbad, and condemned as Idolatry.

When God to cure the Idolatrous Worſhip of inferiour Dæmons, as their Mediators and Advocates with the Supreme God, ſent his own Son into the World to be our Mediator, can we think, that he intended after this, that we ſhould worſhip Angels, and Saints, and the Virgin *Mary*, as our Mediators? When God has given us a viſible Image of himſelf, his Eternal and Incarnate Son, whom we may Worſhip and Adore, did he ſtill intend, that

we ſhould worſhip material and ſenſible Images of Wood or Stone? By the Incarnation of his own Son, God did indeed take care to rectifie mens miſtakes about Creature-Worſhip, and to cut off all pretences for it: Thoſe who pleaded that vaſt diſtance between God and men, and how unfit it was, that Sinners ſhould make their immediate approaches to the Supreme God, and therefore worſhipped inferiour Dæmons as middle Beings between God and man, have now no pretence for this, ſince God has appointed his own Son to be our Mediator: Thoſe who worſhipped Images as the viſible Repreſentations of an inviſible God, have now a viſible Object of Worſhip, a God Incarnate, a God in the nature and likeneſs of a Man; and though we do not now ſee him, yet we have the notion of a viſible God and Mediator to whom we can direct our Prayers in Heaven, which is ſatisfaction enough even to men of more groſs and material Imaginations, without any artificial and ſenſeleſs Repreſentations of the Deity: And was all this done, that men might worſhip Creatures and Images without Idolatry? or rather was it not done to cure mens inclinations to commit Idolatry with Creatures and Images? Whoever believes that the Goſpel of our Saviour was intended as a Remedy againſt Idolatry, can never be perſwaded, that it allows the Worſhip of Saints and Images; which if it be not Idolatry, is ſo exactly like it in all external appearance, that the allowance of it does not look like a proper cure for Idolatry.

SECT. II.

Concerning the great Love of GOD to Mankind, and the Aſſurances of Pardon and Forgiveneſs which the Goſpel gives to all Penitent Sinners; which are much weakned *by ſome Popiſh Doctrines.*

2. THE Goſpel of Chriſt was intended to give the higheſt demonſtration of God's Love to Mankind, and the greateſt poſſible Security to all humble penitent Sinners, of the Forgiveneſs of their Sins: Hence the Goſpel is called the *Grace of God*, and the *Goſpel of Grace*, as being a Diſpenſation of Love and Goodneſs; and therefore whatever leſſens and diſparages the Goſpel-

ſpel-Grace, can be no Goſpel-Doctrine. As to conſider this particularly.

The Goſpel magnifies the Grace of God in giving his own Son for us: *God ſo loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whoſoever believeth in him ſhould not periſh, but have everlaſting life*, 3 John 16. *In this was manifeſted the love of God towards us, becauſe that God ſent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and ſent his Son to be the propitiation for our ſins*, 1 John 4. 9, 10. And St. *Paul* aſſures us, that this is ſuch a glorious manifeſtation of God's love, as will not ſuffer us to doubt of any other expreſſions of his Goodneſs: *He that ſpared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how ſhall he not with him alſo freely give us all things?* 8 Rom. 32. So that the Goſpel of our Saviour gives us much higher demonſtrations of God's love and goodneſs, than either the Light of Nature, or the Law of *Moſes* did. Love is the prevailing Attribute of God under the Goſpel-diſpenſation, For *God is love, and he that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him*, 1 John 4. 16.

Thus the Goſpel of Chriſt gives a humble Penitent as great aſſurance of Pardon, as his own guilty Fears can deſire; for Repentance and Remiſſion of Sins is preached in the Name of Chriſt: He has expiated our Sins by the Sacrifice of his Death, *God commendeth his love towards us, in that while we were yet ſinners, Chriſt died for us, much more then being juſtified by his bloud, we ſhall be ſaved from wrath through him; for if when we were enemies we were reconciled unto God by the death of his Son, much more being reconciled we ſhall be ſaved by his life*, 5 Rom. 8, 9, 10. For as he was delivered for our Offences, ſo he was raiſed again for our Juſtification; And *him hath God exalted to be a Prince and a Saviour to give repentance unto Iſrael, and remiſſion of ſins.* So that *if any man ſin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jeſus Chriſt the righteous, who is able to ſave all them to the uttermoſt, that come unto God by him, ſeeing he ever liveth to make interceſſion for them*, 7 Heb. 25. 1 John 2. 1, 2. Theſe are the fundamental Doctrines of Chriſtianity, and therefore nothing can be a Goſpel-Doctrine, which

weakens or overthrows them. Let us then examine the Popiſh Doctrine of Purgatory, and the Invocation of Saints and Angels as our Mediators with God, and ſee how they are reconcileable with the Goſpel-notion of God's love, and that ſecurity it gives us of Pardon through the Merits and Interceſſion of Chriſt.

1. Let us conſider the Doctrine of Purgatory, which is but the outward Court or Region of Hell, where the Puniſhments are as ſevere as in Hell itſelf, only of a leſs continuance; and yet as ſhort as they are, they may laſt many hundred, nay thouſand Years, unleſs their Friends and the Prieſts be more merciful to them, or they themſelves have taken care before Death to pay the Price of their Redemption. This is a barbarous Doctrine, and ſo inconſiſtent with that mighty Love of God to penitent Sinners, as it is repreſented in the Goſpel of Chriſt, that it is not reconcileable with any notion of Love and Goodneſs at all; you may call it Juſtice, you may call it Vengeance, if you pleaſe, but Love it is not, or if it be, it is ſuch a Love as no man can diſtinguiſh from Hatred: for my part I declare, I do not deſire to be thus loved; I ſhould rather chuſe to fall into nothing, when I die, than to endure a thouſand Years torments to be happy for ever; for Humane Nature cannot bear the Thoughts of that: And is this, that wonderful Love of God to Sinners, which is ſo magnified in the Goſpel, to torment thoſe, who are Redeemed by the Bloud of Chriſt, ſome hundred or thouſand Years in the Fire of Purgatory, which is not cooler than the Fire of Hell?

The Light of Nature, I confeſs, never taught this, for Mankind never had any Notion of ſuch an outragious Love; they always thought, that the Love of God conſiſted in doing good, not in damning thoſe, whom he loves, for ſo many Ages: And if this be all the Diſcovery, the Goſpel has made of the Love of God, we have no great reaſon to glory in it. He who can believe, that God, who ſo loved the World, as to give his only begotten Son for the Redemption of Sinners, will torment a penitent Sinner ſo many Years in Purgatory, till he has either endured the puniſhment of his Sins himſelf, or is releaſed by the Charity of his Friends, or the Maſſes of ſome Mercenary Prieſts, deſerves to lie

in

in Purgatory, till he thinks more honourably of the divine goodneſs, and be convinced, that it is no ſuch extravagant commendation of the love of God, to ſend penitent Sinners to Purgatory.

There are two extravagant Notions whereon the Doctrine of Purgatory is founded, which overthrow all the natural Notions men have of Goodneſs, and deſtroy all the hope and confidence of the moſt penitent Sinners in the goodneſs of God. As,

1. That God may forgive Sins, and yet puniſh us for them; for no man can go into Purgatory according to the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, whoſe Sins are not already forgiven: but though his Sins are forgiven, he muſt make ſatisfaction for that temporal puniſhment, which is due to them, either in this World, or in Purgatory: Now how reconcilable theſe two are, to forgive, and to puniſh, let all mankind judge. I believe, very few men think, they are forgiven, when they are puniſhed; for that which all men deſire ſhould be forgiven them, is the puniſhment, they have deſerv'd. What is it, men are afraid of, when they have ſinned? is it not, that they ſhall be puniſhed for it? What is it men deſire, when they deſire Pardon? is it not, that they may not be puniſhed? And is it any comfort to a Malefactor to be pardoned, and to be hanged? Does any man boaſt of his love and kindneſs, or take any comfort in it, who freely forgives him, but exacts the payment of the Debt, or the puniſhment of his fault? And if this be ſo contrary to the very notion of goodneſs and forgiveneſs among men, how comes it to be the notion of goodneſs and forgiveneſs in God? How comes that to be love and goodneſs, which the Sinner receives no benefit by? for love and goodneſs, I think, ſignifies to do good; or if this be goodneſs, let thoſe take comfort in it that can.

If it be ſaid, that it is an Act of goodneſs to exchange the eternal puniſhment of Hell, which is due to ſin, into the Temporal puniſhment of Purgatory, I grant, this is ſomething, but only ask, whether it would not have been a more perfect expreſſion of love and goodneſs, to have remitted the Temporal Puniſhment alſo of, it may be, ſome thouſand years Torment in Purgatory? whe-

whether this might not have been expected under a dispensation of the most perfect love? and from that God, who sent his only begotten Son into the World to save Sinners? Whether those sins are perfectly forgiven, which shall be avenged, tho' not with Eternal, yet with long Temporal Punishments in the next World? Whether any man thinks himself perfectly forgiven, who is punished very severely, tho' not absolutely according to his deserts? And consequently, whether the Doctrine of Purgatory be not a very great diminution of the Love of God, and the Grace of the Gospel? And whether that can be a true Gospel Doctrine, which represents the Love of God, much less then the Love of a kind and good man, who when he forgives the Injury, forgives the whole Punishment of it? Nay, Whether that can be a Gospel Doctrine, which represents the Love of God less than infinite? and I suppose an infinite Love may forgive true Penitents the whole Punishment of their Sins; and then there is no need of Purgatory.

2*ly*. In Purgatory, God does not only punish those, whom he has pardoned, but he punishes for no other reason, but punishment-sake. For thus the *Roman* Doctors tell us, that the Souls in Purgatory, are in a state of Pardon, and in a state of Perfect Grace; and they suffer the pains of Purgatory, not to purge away any remains of Sin, or to purifie and refine them, and make them more fit for Heaven, but only to bear the punishment due to Sin, for which they had made no satisfaction, while they lived. Now I dare boldly affirm, this is irreconcileable with any degree of Love and Goodness: to make any Punishment just, it must have respect to the guilt of sin, to make it an act of goodness, it must be intended for the reformation of the sinner; but when sin is pardoned, the guilt at least is taken away, and therefore such punishments can have no relation to guilt; and when the sinner is in a perfect state of Grace, and needs no amendment, such punishments can have no respect to the good and reformation of the sinner, and therefore such punishments are neither just nor good, and this is the exact notion of Purgatory; and methinks we should consider, whether this agrees with that account the

Gospel

Goſpel gives us of the love and goodneſs of God: ſhould a Prince have a Jayl of the ſame nature with Purgatory, where for ſeveral years he torments thoſe whom he pretends to have pardoned, and who are grown very good men, and good Subjects, and need no correction, or diſcipline, I believe all the World would laugh at thoſe, who ſhould call this, love and goodneſs, pardon and mercy. Hell is very reconcileable with the goodneſs of God, becauſe it is prepared only for thoſe, who are the Objects of a juſt, a righteous Vengeance, and a very good God may be very juſt; but Purgatory can never be reconciled with the ſuperabundant goodneſs of God to ſinners, through Jeſus Chriſt, unleſs men think it a great kindneſs to ſuffer the pains of Hell for ſeveral Months, Years, or Ages for no reaſon, which makes it either juſt or good to ſuffer them. So that a Popiſh Purgatory is inconſiſtent with the belief of God's great Love and Goodneſs to ſinners, in Jeſus Chriſt, and deſtroys the hope and confidence of ſinners: for if they may lie in Purgatory for ſome thouſand years, as they may do, notwithſtanding the Love of God, and the Merits of Chriſt, if the Pope, or the Prieſts, or their Mony be not more merciful unto them, they have no great reaſon to glory much in the Goodneſs of God, though they ſhould go to Heaven at laſt: ſo that our Proteſtant need not diſpute much about Purgatory: let him only ask a Popiſh Prieſt, How the Doctrine of Purgatory can be reconciled with that ſtupendious Love of God declared to penitent ſinners, in his Son Jeſus Chriſt? for it is a contradiction to the Notion of Goodneſs among men, to inflict ſuch terrible puniſhments in meer Grace and Love, even when the ſin is pardoned, and the ſinner reconciled, and no longer in a ſtate of Diſcipline and Tryal.

Secondly, The Doctrine of Purgatory deſtroys, or weakens, that Security the Goſpel hath given Sinners of their Redemption from the Wrath of God, and the juſt puniſhment of their Sins. One great Security, is the Love of God declared to the World by our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, but if the Love of God to penitent Sinners, who are Redeemed by the Blood of Chriſt, be conſiſtent with his tormenting them in Purgatory ſo many thouſand years, as you have

have already heard, it will be a very hard thing to diſtinguiſh ſuch Love from Wrath, and a Sinner, who is afraid of ſo many thouſand years puniſhment, can take no great comfort in it: but beſides this, the Doctrine of Purgatory deſtroys mens hope and confidence in the Merits and Interceſſion of Chriſt, and in the expreſs promiſes of Pardon and Remiſſion of Sins in his Name.

1. It deſtroys mens hopes in the Merits of Chriſt, and the atonement and expiation of his Blood; For if the Blood of Chriſt does not deliver us from the puniſhment of Sin, what ſecurity is this to a Sinner? Yes, you'll ſay, Chriſt has Redeemed us from Eternal, tho' not from Temporal Puniſhments, and therefore penitent Sinners have this ſecurity by the expiation of Chriſt's Death, that they ſhall not be eternally Damned: This I know the Church of *Rome* teaches; but I deſire to know, How any man can be ſatisfied from Scripture, that Chriſt by his Death has delivered us from Eternal Puniſhments, if he have not delivered us from Temporal Puniſhments of Sin in the next World? I thankfully acknowledge, and it is the only hope I have, that the Goſpel has given us abundant aſſurance of the expiation and atonement made for Sin by the Blood of Chriſt; but what I ſay is this, that if theſe Texts which prove our Redemption by the Death of Chriſt, do not prove, that Chriſt has redeemed us from the whole puniſhment due to Sin in the next World, they prove nothing, and then we have not one place of Scripture to prove, that Chriſt by his Death has redeemed us from Eternal Puniſhments; which is enough to make all Chriſtians abhor the Doctrine of Purgatory, if it deſtroy the Doctrine of Salvation by Jeſus Chriſt. As to ſhow this briefly:

The hope and ſecurity of Sinners depends upon ſuch Scripture expreſſions as theſe: that Chriſt has *died for our ſins*, that he has made *atonement* for ſin, that he is *a propitiation through faith in his blood*, that he has *redeemed us from the curſe of the law, being made a curſe for us*: that *remiſſion and forgiveneſs of ſins is preached in his name; that by him we are juſtified from all thoſe things, from which we could not be juſtified by the Law of Moſes*, that *being juſtified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*; that

that *we are reconciled unto God*, and *ſaved from wrath by him.* Now I deſire to know, Whether all theſe expreſſions ſignifie, that for Chriſt's ſake, and through the atonement and expiation of his Blood, a penitent Sinner ſhall be delivered from the puniſhment due to his ſins? If they do not ſignifie this, how is a Sinner ſecured, that though his ſins are pardoned, and he is juſtified, and reconciled to God, and redeemed from the Curſe of the Law, and ſaved from Wrath, he ſhall not after all this be damned for his ſins, ſince that is the puniſhment of ſin, which it ſeems is not removed, when the ſin is pardoned, and the Sinner juſtified and reconciled to God? If theſe expreſſions do not ſignifie taking away the puniſhment of ſin, I deſire one Text of Scripture to prove, that a Sinner, who is pardoned and juſtified, ſhall not undergo the Eternal Puniſhment of his ſins. If to be pardoned and juſtified, *&c.* does ſignifie to be delivered from the puniſhment of ſin, I deſire to know, How a ſinner, who is pardoned and juſtified, can be puniſhed for his ſins? that is, How a ſinner, who is releaſed from the Puniſhment of his ſins, ſhould be bound to ſuffer the puniſhment of his ſins in Purgatory?

Our *Roman* Adverſaries do indeed diſtinguiſh between the Temporal and Eternal Puniſhment of Sin; the Eternal Puniſhment of Sin, they ſay, Chriſt has made ſatisfaction for, and that is removed by his Death, that no penitent Sinner ſhall be Eternally damned; but a Sinner muſt make ſatisfaction for the Temporal puniſhment of Sin himſelf, either in this World, or in Purgatory: and conſequently that forgiveneſs of Sins, ſignifies the remiſſion of the Eternal Puniſhment of ſin, but not of the Temporal: now I ſhall not put them to prove this diſtinction from Scripture, which is a very unreaſonable Task, becauſe there is nothing in Scripture about it; but yet I would gladly be ſecured, that I ſhall be ſaved from Eternal Puniſhments; and therefore I would gladly know, how forgiveneſs of Sins, and our Redemption from the Curſe of the Law, ſignifies our deliverance from Eternal Puniſhments, if they do not ſignifie our deliverance from the Puniſhment of our ſins? And how they can ſignifie our deliverance from the puniſhment of our ſins, if notwithſtanding this we muſt ſuffer the puniſhment

niſhment of our ſins in Purgatory? If they ſignifie, that we ſhall not be puniſhed for our ſins, then indeed they may ſignifie, that we ſhall not be Eternally Puniſhed; but they cannot ſignifie, that we ſhall not be Eternally puniſhed, unleſs they ſignifie that we ſhall not be puniſhed, and therefore not in Purgatory neither; if that be the Puniſhment of ſin. The truth is, this is a very fenceleſs diſtinction between the Temporal and Eternal Puniſhment of ſin: for I deſire to know, Whether the Temporal Puniſhment be not the Puniſhment of ſin? be not the Curſe of the Law? if it be, then forgiveneſs of ſin, if it remits the Puniſhment, remits the Temporal Puniſhment, for that is the Puniſhment of ſin; then our Redemption from the Curſe of the Law, redeems us from Purgatory, for that is the Curſe of the Law too, if you add, and from Death, for that is the Curſe of the Law too, and yet thoſe who are redeemed and juſtified, die ſtill; which ſhows the fallacy of this Argument, for it ſeems Redemption from the Curſe of the Law, does not ſignifie our Redemption from the whole Curſe, for then a juſtified Perſon muſt not die, ſince bare dying is part of the Curſe. I anſwer, this had certainly been true, had not the neceſſity of dying been expreſly excepted out of this Redemption; for *in Adam all die*, and *it is appointed* (by a Divine Decree) *for all men once to die*, and could they ſhow, where Purgatory is excepted too, then I would grant, that thoſe who are redeemed from the Curſe of the Law might fall into Purgatory, if that be any comfort to them: and yet the caſe is vaſtly different between Death and Purgatory: for though Death be the Curſe of the Law, yet we may be delivered from Death as a Curſe and Puniſhment, without being delivered from the neceſſity of dying: and thus good men are redeemed from Death: for their Sins are expiated and pardoned, and then the Sting of Death is gone; for *the ſting of death is ſin*, and therefore when our Sins are pardoned, Death cannot ſting us, can do us no hurt; becauſe it does not deliver us over to Puniſhment, but tranſplants us into a more happy State. The fears of Death are conquered by the promiſes of Immortal Life, and Death itſelf ſhall at the laſt day be ſwallowed up in Victory, when our dead Bodies

dies ſhall be raiſed immortal and glorious, ſo that tho' good men ſtill die, yet they are redeemed from the Curſe of the Law, from Death itſelf as a Curſe and a Puniſhment. But the Popiſh Purgatory is a place of Puniſhment, and nothing but Puniſhment; and therefore is not reconcileable with the remiſſion and forgiveneſs of ſin.

Again I ask, Whether there are two kinds of Puniſhments due to ſin, Temporal and Eternal, of ſuch a diſtinct nature and conſideration, that the Promiſe of forgiveneſs does not include both? Nay, that God cannot forgive both; that only the Eternal Puniſhment can be forgiven, but the Temporal Puniſhment muſt be ſatisfied for, or endured by the Sinner: if this were the caſe indeed, then I would grant, the Promiſe of forgiveneſs could extend only to Eternal Puniſhments, becauſe God can forgive no other; and the forgiveneſs of Eternal Puniſhment, does not include the forgiveneſs of the Temporal Puniſhment. But if the Curſe of the Law be Eternal Death, and all other Puniſhments, which can properly be called the puniſhment of ſin (for Correction and Diſcipline is not the Wrath of God, and the Curſe of the Law) are only parts of the Curſe, and a partial execution of it; if the only thing, that makes Sinners obnoxious to Temporal Puniſhments is, that they are under the Sentence of Eternal Death, which God may execute by what degrees he pleaſes; then to forgive Eternal Puniſhment muſt include the forgiveneſs of Temporal Puniſhments, as parts or branches of it. As ſuppoſe there were a Law, that no man ſhould ſuffer any Bodily Puniſhments, but ſuch a Malefactor as is condemned to die, but when the Sentence of Death is paſt upon him, it ſhould be at the Prince's pleaſure to defer the Execution of this Sentence, as long as he pleaſed, and in the mean time to inflict all other Puniſhments on him, whatever he pleaſed; in this Caſe to Pardon the Sentence of Death, would deliver ſuch a man from all other Puniſhments too, which by the Law are due only to that man, who is under the Sentence of Death: and in ſuch a Conſtitution for any man to ſay, that the Prince's Pardon extends only to Life, but does not excuſe from Whipping and Pilloring, and per-

petual Impriſonment, would be to make the Pardon void, ſince no man by the Law can ſuffer thoſe other Puniſhments but he who is Condemned to Die, and therefore he who is pardoned the Sentence of Death, in conſequence of that is pardoned all other Puniſhments too.

Thus it is here, the original Curſe againſt ſin was, *in the day, that thou eateſt thereof, thou ſhalt ſurely die*, which by the Goſpel of Chriſt is expounded of Eternal Death, and there is no other threatning in all the Goſpel againſt ſin, but Eternal Death; and therefore all other Puniſhments are inflicted by Vertue of this Law, and conſequently he who is delivered from this Curſe of the Law, from Eternal Puniſhments, is delivered from the whole Puniſhment due to ſin; unleſs they can find ſome other Law in the Goſpel, beſides that which threatens Eternal Death, which obliges a Sinner to Puniſhment.

Again, ſince they acknowledge, that Chriſt by his Death has delivered us from Eternal Puniſhments, I do not think it worth the while to Diſpute with them, whether thoſe Sufferings and Calamities, which good men are expoſed to in this World, may properly be called Puniſhments, or only Correction and Diſcipline; but I deſire to know, Why they call Purgatory, which is a place of Puniſhment in the other World, a Temporal Puniſhment? for this is an abuſe of the Language of Scripture, which makes this World Temporal, and the next World Eternal, as St. *Paul* expreſly tells us; *the things, which are ſeen, are temporal, but the things, which are not ſeen, are eternal*, 2 Cor. 4. 18. And therefore Temporal Puniſhments ſignifie the Puniſhments in this World, but the unſeen Puniſhments, as well as the unſeen Rewards, of the next World are Eternal: which is a demonſtration, that there is no Purgatory, unleſs it be Eternal, and then it is but another Name for Hell, and therefore the State of the next World is called either Life or Death, eternal life, or eternal death: thoſe *who believe in Chriſt ſhall never die*, 1 *John* 25, 26. Now I deſire to know the difference between Living, and Dying, and Periſhing in the next World; for bad men do not ceaſe to be, nor looſe all ſence in the next World, no more than good men; and therefore Life can only

only ſignifie a ſtate of Happineſs, and Death a ſtate of Miſery, which is much worſe than not being: now if good men muſt not periſh, muſt not die, but live, in the next World, they muſt not go to Purgatory, which is as much periſhing, as much dying, as Hell, though not ſo long; but if they muſt never die, never periſh, they muſt never ſuffer the pains of Purgatory, which is a dying and periſhing, that is, a ſtate of Torment and Miſery, while they continue there.

Let us then ſee how a Papiſt, who believes a Purgatory-fire in the next World, wherein he ſhall be tormented (God knows how long!) for his Sins, can prove that a penitent Sinner ſhall not be eternally damned: Oh! ſays he, Chriſt has died for our Sins, and made attonement for them, and we are pardoned and juſtified through Faith in his Bloud; and what then, may we not ſtill be puniſhed for our Sins? If not, what becomes of Purgatory? If we may, prove, that we ſhall not be eternally damned for Sin, which is the proper puniſhment of it: For if to be pardoned and juſtified, ſignifie to be delivered from puniſhment, it ſignifies our deliverance from the whole puniſhment of Sin, ſince the Scripture does not limit it: if they do not ſignifie our deliverance from puniſhment, then we may be eternally puniſhed for Sin, though we are pardoned and juſtified.

But we are *redeemed from the curſe of the Law, and ſaved from wrath.* But if ſuch a man may go to Purgatory, why not to Hell? Or if the Curſe of the Law, and the Wrath of God be in Hell, but not in Purgatory, though the torments are equally great, why may not he lie for ever in Purgatory, as well as a thouſand Years, with this comfort, that though he be infinitely tormented, yet it is not *the curſe of the Law*, nor *the wrath of God.*

Well, but Chriſt has promiſed, That thoſe *who believe in him, ſhall not periſh, but have everlaſting life:* And that proves that the pains of Purgatory cannot be for ever, for then Chriſt could not make good his promiſe of beſtowing everlaſting Life on them: ſo I confeſs one would think, and ſo I ſhould have thought alſo, that when Chriſt promiſed, that ſuch Believers ſhould not periſh,

and

and ſhould never die, that he meant, ſuch men ſhould not go to Purgatory in the next World; but if falling into Purgatory be *not periſhing, and not dying*, it may be *everlaſting life* too, for ought I know, and then the pains of Purgatory may be eternal.

Whoever would not forfeit all the aſſurance the Goſpel has given us, of our Redemption from Hell, and a glorious Immortality, muſt reject the Popiſh Doctrine of Purgatory, as a flat contradiction to all the gracious Promiſes of the Goſpel: for Hell, or an eternal Purgatory, is as reconcileable with the Promiſes of Forgiveneſs and immortal Life, as the Popiſh Purgatory is.

2. This Doctrine of Purgatory deſtroys our hope and confidence in the Mediation and Interceſſion of Chriſt, and that for theſe two plain reaſons: 1. As it repreſents him leſs merciful and compaſſionate; And 2. leſs powerful, than the wants and neceſſities of Sinners require him to be. For

I. After all that is ſaid in Scripture of his being ſo *merciful and compaſſionate an High-Prieſt*, a Sinner who hears what is told him of Purgatory, could wiſh him a great deal more compaſſionate than he is: for it is no great ſign of tenderneſs and compaſſion to leave his Members in Purgatory-fire, which burns as hot as Hell. Could I believe this of our Saviour, I ſhould have very mean thoughts of his kindneſs, and not much rely on him for any thing: We ſhould think him far enough from being a merciful and compaſſionate Prince, who can be contented to torture his Subjects for a year together; and it is a wonderful thing to me, that when a merciful man cannot ſee a Beaſt in torment without relieving it, it ſhould be thought conſiſtent with the mercy and compaſſion of our Saviour, to ſee us burn in Purgatory for Years and Ages. To be ſure this deſtroys all our hope in him in this World; for why ſhould we think, he will be concerned what we ſuffer here, who can contentedly let us lie in Purgatory, to which all the calamities and ſufferings of this life are meer trifles? O Bleſſed and Merciful JESU! pardon ſuch Blaſphemies as theſe. For

II. If he be compaſſionate, he muſt want Power to help us; and that deſtroys the hope of Sinners as much as want of Compaſſion.

passion. It must be want of Will or Power in him, that he does not deliver us from Purgatory as well as Hell: and if he want Power to deliver us from Purgatory, for my part I should more question his Power to deliver from Hell, for that is the harder of the two: if his Bloud could not expiate for the Temporal punishment of Sin, which the Merits of some Supererogating Saints, or the Pope's Indulgence, or the Priests Masses can redeem us from, how could it make expiation for Eternal punishment? If his Interest in the Court of Heaven will not do the less, how can it do the great? There is no Doctrine more irreconcileable with the perfect Love and Goodness of God, and the Merits and Intercession of our Saviour, which are the Fundamental Doctrines of the Gospel, which is a Dispensation of Love and Grace, than this of Purgatory, and therefore we may safely conclude, that this is no Gospel-Doctrine.

2. Let us now examine the Doctrine of Invocation of Saints and Angels as our Mediators with God, and see whether it does not disparage the Grace of the Gospel, the Love of God, and of our Mediator and Advocate Jesus Christ, to penitent Sinners. Now a very few words will decide this matter.

1. With respect to God; now can that man believe, that God is so very gracious to Sinners for the sake of Christ, who seeks to so many Advocates and Mediators to interceed for him with God. To imagine that we want any Mediator to God, but only our High-Priest, who mediates in Vertue of his Sacrifice, is a reproach to the Divine Goodness. The Wisdom and Justice of God may require a Sacrifice, and a High-Priest to make Attonement for Sin, but Infinite Goodness needs not any Entreaties, and meer Intercessions to move him. A truly good man, who knows a proper Object of his kindness, needs not to be asked to do good. The use of such Advocates and Mediators among men, is either to recommend an unknown Person to the favour of the Prince, or fairly to represent his cause to him, which has been mis-represented by others, or to procure favour for an undeserving person, or among equal Competitors, to procure some one to be preferred; this is all the use of Intercession among men:

for

for a good, and wiſe, and juſt Prience, will do what is wiſe, and juſt, and good, not only without Interceſſors, but againſt all Interceſſions to the contrary. Now I ſuppoſe no man will ſay, that God wants Mediators and Advocates upon any of theſe accounts; for he knows every man, underſtands perfectly his cauſe, will never be perſwaded by any Interceſſions to ſhew kindneſs to unfit Objects, that is, to impenitent Sinners; and his Goodneſs is ſo unconfined, and ſo extenſive to all, that there can never be any competition for his Favour; and therefore to multiply Advocates and Mediators to God, muſt argue a great diſtruſt of his Mercy and Goodneſs, which a kind and good Prince would take very ill of us.

God indeed has commanded us to Pray for one another in this World, as he has to pray for our ſelves; but this is not by way of Intereſt and Merit, as the Church of *Rome* pretends, the Saints in Heaven pray for us, but by humble Supplications, which is very reconcileable with the goodneſs of God, to make Prayer a neceſſary condition of granting Pardon and other Bleſſings we want: but as the uſe of Prayer for our ſelves, is not to move God meerly by our importunities to do good to us, for we muſt pray in Faith, that is, with a humble aſſurance and confidence that God will hear us, which includes a firm Belief of his readineſs to grant, what we pray for; ſo neither are our Prayers for others to move God by our intereſt in him, that is, they are not the Interceſſions of Favourites, but of humble Supplicants.

There was great reaſon why God ſhould make Prayer the condition of our receiving, though he wants not our importunities to move him, becauſe there are a great many excellent Virtues exerciſed in Prayer; ſuch as great ſorrow for Sin, great humility of Mind, faith in God's Promiſes, the acts of Love, and affiance and truſt in God, and a conſtant dependance on his Grace and Providence for all ſpiritual and temporal Bleſſings: and there was great reaſon why he ſhould command us to pray for others, tho' he wants none of our Interceſſions for them; becauſe it is a mutual exerciſe of Charity, of Love to our Brethren, and Forgiveneſs to our Enemies, and is a mighty obligation to do all other acts

acts of kindneſs; for thoſe who know it to be their Duty to pray for one another, will think themſelves bound to do good to one another alſo: This becomes thoſe, who live and converſe together in this World, becauſe it is a great inſtrument of Virtue, and that is a reaſon why God ſhould encourage the exerciſe of it by promiſing to hear our Prayers for each other.

But as far as meer goodneſs is concerned, the Goſpel repreſents God as ſo very good to Sinners, that there is no need of any Interceſſor for them: For *God ſo loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whoſoever believes in him ſhould not periſh, but have everlaſting life*, 3 John 16. This was an act of goodneſs antecedent to the Incarnation and Death of Chriſt, and the higheſt act of goodneſs that God could manifeſt to the World, and therefore ſecures us of God's love and goodneſs to Sinners without a Mediator and Advocate; for that love which provided a Mediator for us, was without one, and proves, that it was not for want of goodneſs, or that he needed entreaties, that he gave his Son to be our mediator. And therefore hence S. *Paul* proves, how ready God is to beſtow all good things on us: *He that ſpared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how ſhall he not with him alſo freely give us all things*, 8 Rom. 32. And our Saviour himſelf repreſents the goodneſs of God, by the tenderneſs and compaſſion of an earthly Parent: *If ye then being evil* (that is, leſs good than God is) *know how to give good things to your children, how much more ſhall your heavenly Father give good things to them that ask him*, 7 Matth. 11. eſpecially in the Parable of the Prodigal, where our Saviour deſcribes the goodneſs of God to Sinners, by that paſſion and joy wherewith the Father received his returning Prodigal; nay, he aſſures his Diſciples, that there was no need of his own Interceſſion to incline God to be good and kind to them: *At that day ye ſhall ask in my name, and I ſay not unto you, that I will pray the Father for you, for the Father himſelf loveth you, becauſe ye have loved me, and believed that I came out from God*, 16 John 26, 27. God is ſo infinitely good, that he needs no Mediators or Interceſſors to incline him to all acts of goodneſs; but as he is the wiſe and juſt Governour of the World,

he requires a Sacrifice for Sin, and a High-Prieſt to make Attonement for it, and to interceed in vertue of the Sacrifice. Such a Mediator Chriſt is, who alone is both our Sacrifice and our Prieſt, and therefore our only Mediator; not to incline God to be good, for that he was before, infinitely good, or elſe he had not given his Son to be our Sacrifice and our High-Prieſt, but to make Attonement for our Sins, and thereby to reconcile the exerciſe of God's goodneſs with his wiſdom and juſtice in Governing the World. Such a Mediator and High-Prieſt does not leſſen the Divine goodneſs, for the intention of his Mediation is not to make God good and kind, but to make it wiſe and juſt in God to do good to Sinners; but all other Mediators in Heaven, whoſe buſineſs it is by Prayers, and Entreaties, and Intereſt, and Favour to incline God to be good to ſuch particular perſons as they interceed for, is a real diſparagement to the Divine goodneſs; as if he would not be good unleſs he were conquered by Entreaties, and over ruled by the prevailing Interceſſions of ſome great Favourites: and yet ſuch Mediators as theſe the Saints, and Angels, and Virgin *Mary* are, if they be Mediators at all; and therefore to pray to them as to our Mediators, argues ſuch a diffidence and diſtruſt of God's goodneſs, as does not become the Goſpel of our Saviour; this can be no Goſpel Doctrine, becauſe it is irreconcileable with that account the Goſpel gives us of the Love of God.

2. Nor is it leſs injurious to the Love of our Saviour, to flie to the Prayers and Aids of Saints, and Angels, and the Virgin *Mary* her ſelf. I ſhall not now diſpute, what encroachment this is upon the Mediatorſhip of Chriſt, to make our Addreſſes and Applications to other Mediators; but whoever does ſo, muſt either think that Chriſt wants Intereſt with God, without the joynt Interceſſion of Saints and Angels, or that he wants Kindneſs to us, and either will not interceed for us at all, or will not do it unleſs he be prevailed with by the Interceſſion of Saints, or the Entreaties or the Commands of his Mother. I ſuppoſe they will not pretend, that he wants power to do, what we ask of him, when he himſelf has aſſured us, That *whatſoever we ask of the Father in his name, he will give it us*, 15 John 16. 16 John 23, 24. Does

our

our Mediatour then need other Mediators to interceed with him for us? What! he who became man for us? who lived a laborious and afflicted life for us? who loved us ſo, as to give himſelf for us? who is a merciful and compaſſionate High-Prieſt, and touched with a feeling of our infirmities, being in all things tempted like as we are, yet without Sin?

What a change does this make in the whole Goſpel? Had not the Church of *Rome* found out ſome better ſecurity for Sinners, in the Mediation of Saints, and Angels, and the Bleſſed Virgin, what a hopeleſs State had we been in? For all that the Goſpel tells us is, That God in great love and goodneſs to Sinners, ſent his Son to be our Saviour; and that we might have the greater aſſurance of his pity and compaſſion for us, he became Man, Fleſh of our Fleſh, and Bone of our Bone; and not only ſo, but ſubmitted to all the weakneſſes and infirmities of our Natures, to the greateſt ſhame and reproach, to the ſharpeſt pains, and the moſt infamous Death, that he might the better know, what our temptations and ſufferings are in this World, and might be more ſenſibly affected with our condition in all our ſufferings: This one would have thought, ſhould have given the greateſt ſecurity to Sinners of his readineſs to help them, who did and ſuffered all this for them; and this is the onely ſecurity which the Goſpel of our Saviour gives us. But it ſeems Chriſt is not merciful and pitiful enough; his Virgin Mother has ſofter and tenderer paſſions, and ſuch an intereſt in him, or authority over him, in the right of a Mother, as ſome of them have not without Blaſphemy repreſented it, that ſhe can have any thing of him; and thus they ſuppoſe the other Saints to be much more pitiful than Chriſt is, and to have intereſt enough to protect their Supplicants, or elſe it is not imaginable why they ſhould need or deſire any other Advocates. Now let any man who underſtands the Goſpel, and finds there how the love of Chriſt is magnified, not only in dying for us, but in his being a merciful and compaſſionate High-Prieſt, that this is the only hope of Sinners, That *if any man ſin, we have an advocate with the Father Jeſus Chriſt the righteous, who is alſo a propitiation for our ſins*, think the Invocation of Saints, as our Patrons and Advocates, to be a Goſpel-Doctrine, if he can.

SECT. III.

Concerning the Nature of Christian Worship.

3. ANother manifest design of the Gospel, was to reform the Worship of God, not only by extirpating Idolatry, but by purging it from all Pagan and Jewish Superstitions, and to appoint such a Worship as is more agreeable to the Nature both of God and Man. And whoever will take the pains to compare the Worship of the Church of *Rome*, with that Worship which our Saviour has prescribed in the Gospel, will easily discover how unlike they are. Let us then consider what Christ has reformed in the Worship of God, and what kind of Worship he has prescribed to his Disciples.

I. What he has Reformed in the Worship of God; and that may be comprehended in one word, he has taken away all that was meerly External in Religion. By which I do not mean that our Saviour has forbid all External Acts of Worship, or such External Circumstances as are necessary to the decent and orderly performance of Religious Worship, which the nature and reason of things requires under all Dispensations of Religion; but that he has laid aside all such External Rites as either were, or were thought to be in themselves Acts of Religion, and to render such Worshippers very acceptable to God. A great many such Rites there were in the Pagan Religion, and a great many in the Jewish Worship of God's own Institution, and a great many more which the Tradition of the Elders, and the Superstition of the Scribes and Pharisees had introduced.

We know the *Jewish* Worship consisted of External Rites; in their Temple, and Altars, and Sacrifices, and Washings, and Purifications, in New Moons and Sabbaths, and Festival Solemnities, in Consecrated Garments and Vessels for the Service of the Temple, in distinction of Meats, *&c.* the very External observance of these Rites, were Acts of Religion, and necessary to make their Worship acceptable to God; and the wilful and presumptuous neglect or contempt of them, was punished with Death.

Now

Now our Saviour has abrogated all theſe *Jewiſh* Rites, and has Inſtituted nothing in the room of them, excepting the two Sacraments, Baptiſm, and the Lord's Supper, which are of a very different Nature and Uſe, as we ſhall ſee preſently: He did not indeed, while he was on Earth, blame the Obſervation of the Law of *Moſes*, which till that time was in full force, and which he obſerved himſelf, but he blamed the External Superſtitions of the Phariſees, in waſhing Cups and Platters, and making broad their Phylacteries, and thinking themſelves very righteous perſons, for their ſcrupulous obſervation even of the Law of *Moſes*, in paying Tithe of Mint and Cummin, &c. while they neglected *the weightier matters of the Law, judgement, mercy, and faith*, 23 Mat. 23. But when our Saviour was Riſen from the Dead, and had accompliſhed all the Types and Shadows of the Law, then the Apoſtles with greater freedom oppoſed a Legal and External Righteouſneſs, and though they did for a time indulge the *Jews* in the Obſervation of the Rites of *Moſes*, yet they aſſerted the Liberty of the Gentile Converts from that Yoke, as we may ſee in the firſt Council at *Antioch*, and in St. *Paul*'s Diſputes with the *Jews*, in his Epiſtles to the *Romans* and *Galatians*, and elſewhere. And indeed whoever conſiders the Nature of the Chriſtian Religion, will eaſily ſee, that all thoſe ends, which ſuch External Rites ſerved either in the *Jewiſh* or *Pagan* Religion, have no place here, and therefore nothing that is meerly External can be of any uſe or value in the Chriſtian Worſhip. As to ſhow this particularly.

1. There is no expiation or ſatisfaction for ſin under the Goſpel, but only the Blood of Chriſt, and therefore all External Rites are uſeleſs to this purpoſe. Him and him only *God hath ſet forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood.* 3 Rom. 23. Death was the puniſhment of ſin, and Death is the only expiation of it; and none elſe has died for our ſins but Chriſt alone, and therefore he only is a propitiation for our ſins; and yet we know, how great a part both of the *Pagan* and *Jewiſh* Religion was taken up in the expiation of ſin: all their Sacrifices to be ſure were deſigned for this purpoſe, and ſo were their Waſhings and Purifications in

ſome

ſome degree, and many other voluntary Severities and Superſtitions, this being the principal thing they intended in their Religious Rites, to appeaſe God and make him propitious to them; ſince then Chriſt has made a full and compleat ſatisfaction and atonement for ſin, and there is no expiation or ſatisfaction required of us, all external Rites for expiation and atonement can have no place in the Chriſtian Worſhip, without denying the atonement of Chriſt, and this neceſſarily ſtrips Chriſtian Religion of a vaſt number of external Rites practiſed both by *Jews* and *Heathens*.

2*ly*, Nor does the Goſpel admit of any legal Uncleanneſſes and Pollutions, diſtinction between clean and unclean Meats, which occaſioned ſo many Laws and Obſervances both among *Jews* and *Heathens*; ſo many ways of contracting legal Uncleanneſs, and ſo many ways to expiate it, and ſo many Laws about Eating and Drinking, and ſuch Superſtition in Waſhing Hands, and Cups, and Platters, but our Saviour told his Diſciples, *Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth the man, but that which cometh out of the mouth, this defileth the man.* For *whatſoever entreth into the mouth, goeth into the belly, and is caſt out into the draught, but thoſe things, which proceed out of the mouth, come forth from the heart, and they defile the man. For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, falſe witneſſes, blaſphemies, theſe are the things which defile a man; but to eat with unwaſhen hands, defileth not a man.* And this alſo delivers Chriſtian Religion from all thoſe Rites and Obſervances, which concerned legal cleanneſs, which were very numerous.

15 Matth. 11, 17, 18, 19, 20.

3*ly*, Nor is there any Symbolical Preſence of God under the Goſpel, which puts an end to the legal Holineſs of Places and Things. God dwelt among the *Jews* in the Temple at *Jeruſalem*, where were the Symbols and Figures of his Preſence: it was God's Houſe, and therefore a holy place, and every thing that belonged to it had a legal Holineſs: for the Holineſs of Things and Places under the Law, was derived from their relation to God, and his Preſence: this was the only place for their Typical and Ceremonial Worſhip, whither all the Males of the Children

of

of *Iſrael* were to reſort three times a year, and where alone they were to offer their Sacrifices and Oblations to God: the very place gave Virtue to their Worſhip and Sacrifices, which were not ſo acceptable in other places; nay, which could not be offered in other places without ſin, as is evident from *Jeroboam*'s ſin, in ſetting up the Calves at *Dan* and *Bethel* for places of Worſhip, and the frequent Complaints of the Prophets againſt thoſe, who offered Sacrifices in the High Places; and therefore the Diſpute between the *Jews* and *Samaritans* was, which was the place of Worſhip, whether the Temple at *Jeruſalem* or *Samaria*: but Chriſt tells the Woman of *Samaria*, that there ſhould be no ſuch diſtinction of places in the Chriſtian Worſhip: *Woman believe me, the hour cometh, when ye ſhall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jeruſalem worſhip the father.* -----*But the hour cometh and now is, when the true worſhippers ſhall worſhip the father in ſpirit and in truth.* Not as if the Father ſhould not be Worſhipped, neither at *Jeruſalem* nor *Samaria*; but that neither the Temple at *Jeruſalem* nor *Samaria*, ſhould be the peculiar and appropriate place of Worſhip; that God's Preſence and Worſhip ſhould no longer be confined to any one place; that the Holineſs of the place ſhould no longer give any value to the Worſhip; but thoſe who worſhipped God in ſpirit and in truth, ſhould be accepted by him, where-ever they worſhipped him. Such Spiritual Worſhip and Worſhippers, ſhall be as acceptable to God at *Samaria* as at *Jeruſalem*, and as much in the remoteſt Corners of the Earth, as at either of them: for God's Preſence ſhould no longer be confined to any one place, but he would hear our devout Prayers from all parts of the World, where-ever they were put up to him, and conſequently the Holineſs of places is loſt, which conſiſts only in ſome peculiar Divine Preſence, and with the Holineſs of places, the external and legal Holineſs of things ceaſes alſo: for all other things were Holy only with relation to the Temple, and the Temple Worſhip. For indeed God's Typical Preſence in the Temple, was only a Figure of the Incarnation: Chriſt's Body was the true Temple where God dwelt: for which reaſon he calls his Body the Temple, *Deſtroy this Temple, and I will raiſe it up* 4 John 21, 23.

in

in three days: And the Apoſtle aſſures us, that the fulneſs of the Godhead dwelt in Chriſt Bodily, σωματικῶς really and ſubſtantially, in oppoſition to God's Typical Preſence in the material Temple: and therefore when Chriſt was come, who was the true *Emmanuel* or God dwelling among us, and had by his Incarnation accompliſh'd the Type and Figure of the Temple, God would no longer have a Typical and Figurative Preſence.

I will not quarrel with any man, who ſhall call the Chriſtian Churches, and the Utenſils of it, holy things; for being employed in the Worſhip of God, they ought to be ſeparated from common uſes, and reaſon teaches us to have ſuch places and things in ſome kind of religious Reſpect, upon the account of their relation, not to God, but to his Worſhip; but this is a very different thing from the Typical Holineſs of the Temple and Altar, and other things belonging to the Temple, and there are two plain differences between them, the firſt with reſpect to the cauſe, the ſecond with reſpect to the effect: the cauſe of this legal Holineſs, was God's peculiar Preſence in the Temple, where God choſe to dwell as in his own Houſe, which Sanctified the Temple, and all things belonging to it: the effect was that this Holineſs of the Place Sanctified the Worſhip, and gave value and acceptation to it: the firſt needs no proof, and the ſecond we learn from what our Saviour tells the Scribes and Phariſees. *Wo unto you, ye blind guides, which ſay, whoſoever ſhall ſwear by the temple it is nothing, but whoſoever ſhall ſwear by the gold of the temple, he is a debtor; ye fools and blind, for whether is greater, the gold, or the temple, that ſanctifieth the gold? And whoſoever ſhall ſwear by the altar, it is nothing, but whoſoever ſweareth by the gift, that lieth upon it, he is guilty: ye fools and blind, for whether is greater, the gift, or the Altar that ſanctifieth the gift?* So that it ſeems, there was ſuch a Holineſs in the Temple and Altar, as conveyed a Holineſs and Sanctity to other things, even to the Oblations and Sacrifices, which were offered there. But now whatever Holineſs there is in Chriſtian Churches and Oratories, they are ſanctified by the worſhip, that is performed there, not the worſhip ſanctified by them. It is the Aſſembly of Chriſtians themſelves, that is the Church

23 Matth. 16, 17, 18, 19.

Church, the Houſe, the holy and living Temple of God, not the building of Wood or Stone wherein they meet: God and Chriſt is peculiarly preſent in the Aſſemblies of Chriſtians, though not by a Figurative and Symbolical Preſence, and thus he is preſent in the places, when Chriſtians meet, and which are Conſecrated and Separated to Religious Uſes, and there is a natural Decency in the thing, to ſhew ſome peculiar Reſpects to the places, where we ſolemnly Worſhip God; but the preſence of God is not peculiar to the place as it was appropriated to the Temple of *Jeruſalem*, but it goes along with the Company and the Worſhip; and therefore the place may be called Holy, not upon account of its immediate relation to God, as God's Houſe, wherein he dwells, but its relation to Chriſtians, and that Holy Worſhip, which is perſormed there; and I ſuppoſe every one ſees the vaſt difference between theſe two: and thus all that vaſt number of Ceremonies, which related to this external and legal Holineſs of Places, Veſſels, Inſtruments, Garments, *&c.* have no place in the Chriſtian Worſhip, becauſe there is no Typical and Symbolical Preſence of God, and conſequently no ſuch legal Holineſs of places and things, under the Goſpel.

4*ly*, Nor are material and inanimate things made the Receptacles of Divine Graces and Vertues under the Goſpel, to convey them to us meerly by Contract and external Applications; like ſome Amulets or Charms, to wear in our Pockets, or hang about our Necks. There was nothing like this in the *Jewiſh* Religion, though there was in the *Pagan* Worſhip, but under the Goſpel Chriſt beſtows his holy Spirit on us, as the principle of a new divine Life, and from him alone we muſt immediately receive all Divine Influences and Vertue, and not ſeek for theſe heavenly Powers in ſenceleſs things, which can no more receive, nor communicate Divine Graces to us, then they do Wit and Underſtanding to thoſe who expect Grace from them; For can Grace be lodged in a rotten Bone, or a piece of Wood? or conveyed to our Souls by perſpiration in a kiſs or touch?

5*ly*, The Chriſtian Religion admits of no External or Ceremonial Righteouſneſs. *In Chriſt Jeſus neither circumciſion availeth*

5 Matth. 20. *any thing, nor uncircumciſion, but a new creature, and obedience to the commandments of God, and faith which worketh by love*: The great deſign of the Goſpel, and of all our Saviour's Sermons, being to make us truly holy, that we may be partakers of the Divine Nature, having eſcaped the corruption, which is in the world through luſt. There is nothing our Lord does more ſeverely condemn, than an External and Phariſaical righteouſneſs, which conſiſted either in obſerving the External Rites of the Law of *Moſes*, or their own Superſtitions received by tradition from their Forefathers, and expreſly tells his Diſciples, *except your righteouſneſs exceed the righteouſneſs of the Scribes and Phariſees, ye ſhall in no wiſe enter into the Kingdom of Heaven*: Now this cuts off every thing, which is External in Religion at a blow, becauſe it cuts off all hopes and relyances on an External Righteouſneſs, and I believe men will not be fond of ſuch Superſtitions, when they know, they will do them no good.

6*ly*, And hence it appears, that there can be no place for any thing, that is external, in the Chriſtian Religion, but only for ſome fœderal Rites; ſuch as the two Sacraments of the Goſpel are, Baptiſm and the Lords Supper; the firſt of which is our admiſſion into the new Covenant, the ſecond the exerciſe of Communion with Chriſt in this Goſpel Covenant. And ſuch Rites as theſe are neceſſary in all Inſtituted Religions, which depend upon free and voluntary Covenants: for ſince Mankind has by ſin forfeited their natural right to Gods favour, they can challenge nothing from him now, but by promiſe and Covenant; and ſince ſuch Covenants require a mutual ſtipulation on both ſides, they muſt be tranſacted by ſome viſible and ſenſible Rites, whereby God obliges himſelf to us, and we to him; but theſe being only the ſigns or ſeals of a Covenant, are very proper for a Religion, which rejects all External and Ceremonial Righteouſneſs and Worſhip: for it is not our being in Covenant with God, nor the Sacraments of it, that can avail us, without performing the conditions of the Covenant, and therefore this does not introduce an External Righteouſneſs.

Now

Now whoever has ſuch a Notion and Idea of the Chriſtian Worſhip as this, (and let the Church of *Rome* confute it if ſhe can) will eaſily ſee without much Diſputing, how unlike the Worſhip of the Church of *Rome* is to true Chriſtian Worſhip.

For whoever only conſiders, the vaſt number of Rites and Ceremonies in the Church of *Rome*, muſt conclude it as Ritual and Ceremonial a Religion as *Judaiſm* itſelf; the Ceremonies are as many, more obſcure, unintelligible, and uſeleſs; more ſevere and intollerable, then the *Jewiſh* Yoke itſelf, which St. *Peter* tells the *Jews*, neither they nor their Fathers were able to bear; it is indeed almoſt all Outſide and Pageantry, as unlike the Plainneſs and Simplicity of the Goſpel-Worſhip, as Show and Ceremony can make it.

It is true, external and viſible Worſhip, muſt conſiſt of external Actions; and muſt be performed with ſuch grave and decent circumſtances of time and place, and poſture and habit, as become the Solemnity of Religious Worſhip; this Reaſon and Nature teaches, and this the Church of *England* prudently obſerves, whoſe Ceremonies are not Religious Rites, but decent Circumſtances of Worſhip, few in number (as the neceſſary Circumſtances of Action are but few) and Grave and Solemn in their uſe: but this is not to place Religion in any thing, that is external, but only to pay an external Homage and Worſhip to God, which differ as Worſhipping God in a Decent Habit, differs from the Religion of Conſecrated Habits and Veſtments; or as praying to God with an audible Voice, differs from placing Religion in Words and Sounds which we do not underſtand, or as Kneeling at receiving the Sacrament, differs from a Bodily Worſhip of the Hoſt in bowing the knee.

But though the bare number of external Ceremonies, which are always the Seat of Superſtition, be a great corruption of the Chriſtian Worſhip, yet the number of them is the leaſt fault of the Ceremonies of the Church of *Rome*; as will appear, if we conſider a little their nature.

For 1. Moſt of their external Rites are profeſſedly intended as Expiations and Satisfactions for their Sins. This is the Doctrine

and Practice of the Church of *Rome*, that notwithſtanding the ſatisfaction made by Chriſt, every Sinner muſt ſatisfie for his own Sins, or have the ſatisfaction of other mens applied to him, out of the Treaſury of the Church, by the Pope's Indulgences: this is the meaning of all external Penances in Whippings, Faſtings, Pilgrimages, and other ſuperſtitious Severities; their Backs, or their Feet, or their Bellies muſt pay for their Sins, unleſs they can redeem them out of their Pockets too: now it is plain, that theſe are ſuch external Superſtitions, as can have no place in the Chriſtian Religion, which allows of no other expiation or ſatisfaction for Sin, but the Blood of Chriſt.

2*ly*, Thoſe diſtinctions between Meats, which the Church of *Rome* calls Faſting, (for a Canonical Faſt is not to abſtain from Food, but only from ſuch Meats as are forbid on Faſting Days) can be no part of Chriſtian Worſhip, becauſe the Goſpel allows of no diſtinction between clean and unclean things, and therefore of no diſtinction of Meats neither: for *meat commendeth us not to God*, 1 Cor. 8. 8. The Church of *Rome* indeed does not make ſuch a diſtinction between clean and unclean Beaſts, as the Law of *Moſes* did, and therefore is the more abſurd in forbidding the eating of Fleſh, or any thing that comes of Fleſh, as Eggs, or Milk, or Cheeſe, or Butter, on their Faſting Days, which is to impoſe a new kind of *Jewiſh* Yoke upon us, when the reaſon of it is ceaſed. For there is no imaginable reaſon why it ſhould be an Act of Religion meerly to abſtain from Fleſh, if Fleſh have no legal uncleanneſs; and if it had, we muſt all turn *Carthuſians*, and never eat Fleſh; for how ſhould it be clean one day, and unclean another, is not eaſie to underſtand. I am ſure St. *Paul* makes this part of the Character of the Apoſtacy of the latter days, that they ſhall Command *to abſtain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thankſgiving of them, which believe and know the truth. For every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refuſed, if it be received with thankſgiving. For it is ſanctified by the word of God, and prayer.* And *let no man judge you in meat or drink,* ------*wherefore if ye be dead with Chriſt from the rudiments of the world, why as though living in the world, are ye ſubject*

1 Tim. 4. 3, 4, 5.

to

to ordinances: touch not, taſt not, handle not, which all are to periſh with the uſing, after the Commandments and Doctrines of men? 2 Col. 16, 20, 21, 22.

And yet, though they do not own the legal diſtinctions between clean and unclean things, their Conſecrations would perſwade one, that there were ſomething more than a meer legal uncleanneſs in all Creatures, *viz.* that they are all poſſeſſed by the Devil and wicked Spirits; for when they Conſecrate Salt and Water to make their Holy-water, they firſt exorciſe both the Salt and Water to caſt the Devil out of them: and if ſuch innocent Creatures are poſſeſſed, I doubt none can eſcape; which has made me ſometimes wonder, that they durſt eat any thing before it was firſt exorciſed, for fear the Devil ſhould take poſſeſſion of them with their meat. It is certain, if the Chriſtian Religion takes away all ſuch diſtinctions between Meat and Drinks, the meer abſtaining from Fleſh can be no part of Chriſtian Worſhip, much leſs ſo ſatisfactory and meritorious as the Church of *Rome* pretends, when ſuch Abſtinence is appointed as a ſatisfactory Penance.

3*dly*, As for the Religion of Holy Places, Altars, Veſtments, Utenſils, the Church of *Rome* has infinitely out-done the *Jewiſh* Laws: inſtead of one Temple at *Jeruſalem*, they have thouſands to the full as Holy and Sacred as that, as may appear from their Rites of Conſecration. Though herein, I confeſs, they differ, that the Temple of *Jeruſalem* was only God's Houſe, and that alone made it a Holy Place, becauſe God was there peculiarly preſent; but the Popiſh Churches derive their Sanctity, not ſo much from the preſence of God, (for then they would be all equally Holy) as from ſome great and eminent Saint, who is peculiarly Worſhipped there. It is a great argument of the opinion men have of the Holineſs of any place, to go in Pilgrimage to it, not meerly in Curioſity, but Devotion; as if either going ſo far to ſee the place, were in itſelf an act of Religion, or their Prayers would be better heard there, than if they prayed at home: Thus they travel to *Jeruſalem* to viſit the Holy Land and the Sepulchre, and this may be thought in honour of our Saviour who Lived, and Died, and was Buried there: but otherwiſe I know

not

not any Church or Chappel, which the moſt devout Pilgrims think worth viſiting meerly upon the account of God or Chriſt: The ſeveral Churches or Chappels of the Virgin, eſpecially thoſe which are the moſt famed for Miracles, or the Churches where the Reliques of ſome great and adored Saints are lodged, have their frequent Viſits, for the ſake of the Virgin, or of the Saints; but without ſome Saint Churches loſe their Sacredneſs and Veneration, which I ſuppoſe is the reaſon why they always take care of ſome Reliques to give a Sacredneſs to them, without which no Church can be Conſecrated; that is, its Dedication to the Worſhip of God, cannot make it Holy, unleſs ſome Saint take poſſeſſion of it by his or her Reliques.

This, I confeſs, is not *Judaiſm*, for under the *Jewiſh* Law, all Holineſs of things or places was derived from their relation to God; now the Names, and Reliques, and wonder-working Images of Saints and the Bleſſed Virgin, give the moſt peculiar and celebrated Holineſs; and whether this be not at leaſt to aſcribe ſuch a Divinity to them, as the Pagans did to their Deified Men and Women, to whom they erected Temples and Altars, let any impartial Reader judge. Thoſe muſt have a good ſhare of Divinity, who can give Holineſs to any thing elſe.

But ſince they muſt have Holy Places, and ſomething to anſwer the *Jewiſh* Superſtition, who cried, *The Temple of the LORD, the Temple of the LORD*, I cannot blame them for making choice of Saints to inhabitate their Churches, and ſanctifie them with their preſence, ſince under the Goſpel God is no more preſent in one place than in another: He dwelt indeed in the Temple of *Jeruſalem* by Types and Figures, but that was but a Type of God's dwelling in Humane Nature: the Body of Chriſt was the true Temple, as he told the *Jews*, *Deſtroy this Temple, and in three days I will raiſe it up*; which he ſpake of the Temple of his Body: And now Chriſt is aſcended into Heaven, there is no Temple on Earth; and therefore if they will have Temples, they muſt have the Temples of Saints, for the Preſence of God is now no more confined to a Houſe, than his Providence is to the Land of *Judæa*, as it was in a very peculiar manner, while the Temple

ſtood

ſtood there. God dwells not on Earth now, as he did among the *Jews*, but his Preſence, *viz.* our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, is removed into Heaven, and therefore he has no Houſe on Earth to anſwer to the *Jewiſh* Temple, as the Ancient Fathers aſſerted that the Chriſtians had neither Temples nor Altars: The Chriſtian Church indeed is a holy and living Temple, wherein the Holy Spirit dwells, but that is built not with Stones or Brick, but of living Saints; and therefore the Holineſs of Places, and Altars, and Garments, *&c.* which makes up ſo great a part of the *Roman* Religion, is a manifeſt Corruption of the Simplicity of the Chriſtian Worſhip. The *Jewiſh* Temple made that Worſhip moſt acceptable to God, which was offered there, becauſe it was a Type of Chriſt, and ſignified the acceptance of all our Prayers and Religious Services, as offered up to God only in the Name of Chriſt; but to think that any place is ſo Holy now, that the bare viſiting it, or praying in it, ſhould beſtow a greater holineſs upon us, and all we do, ſhould expiate our Sins, or merit a Reward, is no better than *Jewiſh* or *Pagan* Superſtition.

4*thly*, That the Church of *Rome* does attribute Divine Virtues and Powers to ſenſeleſs and inanimate Things, is ſo evident from that great Veneration they pay to the Reliques, and thoſe great Vertues they aſcribe to them, from their Conſecrations of their *Agnus Dei*, their Wax-candles, Oyl, Bells, Croſſes, Images, Aſhes, Holy-water, for the Health of Soul and Body, to drive away evil Spirits, to allay Storms, to heal Diſeaſes, to pardon *Venial*, and ſometimes Mortal Sins, meerly by kiſſing or touching them, carrying them in their hands, wearing them about their necks, *&c.* that no man can doubt of it who can believe his own eyes, and read their Offices, and ſee what the daily Practice of their Church is. Whoever has a mind to be ſatisfied about it, needs only read Dr. *Brevint*'s *Saul* and *Samuel* at *Endor*, Chap. 15. Theſe things look more like Charms than Chriſtian Worſhip, and are a great Profanation of the Divine Grace and Spirit; indeed they argue that ſuch men do not underſtand, what Grace and Sanctification means, who think that little Images of Wax, that Candles, that Oyl, that Water and Salt, that Bells, that Croſſes, can be ſanctified

fied by the Spirit of God, and convey Grace and Sanctification by the ſight, or ſound, or touch, or ſuch external applications. Chriſt has given his Holy Spirit to dwell in us, which works immediately upon our minds and rational powers, and requires our concurrence to make his Grace effectual to cleanſe and purifie our Souls, and to transform us into the Divine Image; the grace of the Spirit is to enlighten our Minds, to change our Wills, to govern and regulate our Paſſions, to inſtruct, to perſwade, to admoniſh, to awaken our Conſciences, to imprint and fix good thoughts in us, to inſpire us with holy deſires, with great hopes, with divine conſolations, which may ſet us above the fears of the World, and the allurements of it, and give greater fervour to our Devotions, greater ſtrength to our Reſolutions, greater courage and conſtancy in ſerving God, than the bare powers of Reaſon, tho' enforced with ſupernatural Motives, could do. This is all the Sanctification the Goſpel knows, and he who thinks that inanimate Things are capable of this Sanctification of the Spirit, or can convey ſuch Sanctification to us by ſome Divine and Inviſible Effluviums of Grace, may as well lodge Reaſon, and Underſtanding, and Will, and Paſſions in ſenſeleſs matter, and receive it from them again by a kiſs or touch. To be ſure men who know what the Sanctification of the Spirit means, muſt deſpiſe ſuch Fooleries as theſe.

5*ly*, That all this encourages men to truſt in an External Righteouſneſs, is too plain to need a proof; and therefore I ſhall not need to inſiſt long on it.

For 1. ſuch External Rites are naturally apt to degenerate into Superſtition, eſpecially when they are very numerous: The *Jewiſh* Ceremonies themſelves, their Circumciſion, Sacrifices, Waſhings, Purifications, Temple, Altars, New Moons and Sabbaths, and other Feſtival Solemnities, were the Righteouſneſs of the *Scribes* and *Phariſees*, and a cloak for their Hypocriſie and great Immoralities, though they were never intended by God for the juſtification of a Sinner. For ſuch External Rites are ſo much eaſier to carnal men, than to ſubdue their Luſts, and live a holy and vertuous Life, that they are willing to abound in ſuch External Obſer-

Observances, and hope that these will make Expiation for their other Sins; and therefore when the Typical use of these Ceremonies was fulfilled by Christ, the External Rites were Abrogated, that men might no longer place any hope or confidence in any thing which is meerly External: And therefore that Church which fills up Religion with External Rites and Ceremonies, were there no other hurt in it, laies a Snare for Mens Souls, and tempts them to put their trust in an External Righteousness, without any regard to the Internal Purity of Heart and Mind.

Especially 2. when such External Rites are recommended as very acceptable to God, as satisfactions for our Sins, and meritorious of great rewards; and this is the use they serve in the Church of *Rome*, as you have already heard. They assert the necessity of Humane Satisfactions; And what are these satisfactory Works wherewith men must expiate their Sins? The principal of them are Fastings, that is abstaining from Flesh, and other Acts of Penance, as Whippings, Pilgrimages, and some Bodily severities, or Prayers, that is saying over such a number of *Ave-Maries*; or Alms, that is to pay for Indulgencies, or to purchase Masses for themselves, or their Friends in Purgatory, or to found some Religious Houses, or to enrich those that are; which are much more satisfactory and meritorious than common acts of Charity to the Poor: All which men may do, without the least sorrow for Sin, without any true devotion to God, without mortifying any one Lust. They mightily contend for the Merit of Works; but what are their Meritorious Works? Whoever reads the Lives of their Canoniz'd Saints, will easily see what it was that made them Saints: their Characters are usually made up of some *Romish* Superstitions, of their Devotions to the Virgin *Mary*, and their familiar Conversations with her, the severities of their Fasts, and other external Mortifications, their frequenting the Mass, the great numbers of their *Ave-Maries*, pretences to Raptures and Visions, and such wild Extravagancies as made them suspected of Madness, while they lived, and Canoniz'd them for Saints, when they were dead: Other things may be added to fill up their Stories, but these are the glorious Accomplish-

ments, eſpecially of the more Modern Saints: for no man muſt be a Saint at *Rome*, who is not a famous Example of Popiſh Superſtitions.

Monkery is thought the moſt perfect State of Religion among them, and has even Monopolized the Name, for no other perſons are called *the Religious*, but thoſe who belong to one Order or other: And wherein does the Perfection of Monkery conſiſt? 1. In the Vows of Cælibacy, Poverty, and Obedience to the Superiors of their Order, which are all External things, no Virtues in themſelves, and very often the occaſion of great Wickedneſs. 2. In the ſtricteſt Obſervance of the External Rites and Ceremonies of their Religion; of Maſſes, and *Ave-Maries*, and Faſtings, and Penances, and many of them would be glad, if they could go Pilgrimages too. Theſe things are in perfection in their Monaſteries and Nunneries, with ſuch additional Superſtitions as are peculiar to particular Orders. As for other true Chriſtian Vertues, they may as ſoon be found without the Walls of the Monaſtery, as within.

Now when ſuch External Rites and Obſervances ſhall be judged Satisfactions and Expiations for Sin; ſhall be thought the moſt highly meritorious, ſhall be made the Characters of their greateſt Saints, and the moſt perfect ſtate of Religion; I cannot ſee how any true thorough-paced *Romaniſt*, can aim at any thing but a Ceremonial Righteouſneſs.

Indeed the true reaſon why any thinking men are ſo fond of an External and Ceremonial Righteouſneſs, is to excuſe them from true and real Holineſs of Life: all men know that if they mortifie their Luſts, they need not afflict their Bodies with Faſtings, and other ſeverities: that if they have their Converſation in Heaven, they need not travel in Pilgrimages to *Jeruſalem* or *Loretto*; that if they take care to obey the Laws of the Goſpel, they need no ſatisfactions for their Sins, nor no works of Merit or Supererogation, which are nothing elſe but meritorious and ſupererogating ſatisfactions; for all men know, that in the Offices of Piety and Vertue, they can never do more than is their Duty; and therefore as nothing can be matter of Merit, which is our Duty,

ſo

ſo the true intention of all Merits and Works of Supererogation, are to ſupply the place of Duty, and to ſatisfie for their Sins, or to purchaſe a Reward, which they have no title to, by doing their Duty; but a good man, who by believing in Chriſt, and obeying him, has an intereſt in his Merits, and a title to the Goſpel-Promiſes of Pardon and Eternal Life, needs none of theſe Satisfactions, Merits, or Supererogations. Now would any man who believes that he cannot be ſaved without mortifying his Luſts, be at the trouble of Whippings and Faſtings, &c. not to mortifie his Luſts, but to keep them, and to make ſatisfaction for them? Would any man travel to *Jeruſalem*, or the Shrine of any Saint, who believes he ſhall not be forgiven, unleſs he leaves his Sins behind him, which he might as well have parted with at home? The true notion of Superſtition is, when men think to make ſatisfaction for neglecting or tranſgreſſing their Duty, by doing ſomething which is not their Duty, but which they believe to be highly pleaſing to God, and to merit much of him: Now no man who believes that he cannot pleaſe God without doing his Duty, would be ſo fond of doing his Duty, and doing that which is not his Duty, nor pleaſing to God, into the bargain.

3. And yet theſe meritorious and ſatisfactory Superſtitions are very troubleſome to moſt men, and though they are willing to be at ſome pains rather than part with their Luſts, yet they would be at as little trouble as poſſibly they can; and herein the Church of *Rome*, like a very indulgent Mother, has conſulted their eaſe; for one man may ſatisfie for another, and communicate his Merits to him: and therefore thoſe who, by their Friends or Money, can procure a vicarious Back, need not Whip themſelves; they may Faſt, and ſay over their Beads, and perform their Penances and Satisfactions by another, as well as if they did it themſelves; or they may purchaſe Satisfactions and Merits out of the Treaſury of the Church, that is, they may buy Indulgencies and Pardons; or it is but entring into ſome Confraternity, and then you ſhall ſhare in their Merits and Satisfactions. This is an imputed Righteouſneſs with a witneſs, and I think very External too, when men can ſatisfie and merit by Proxies.

4. And I think it may pass for an External Righteousness too, when men are sanctified and pardoned by Reliques, Holy-water, Consecrated Beads, Bells, Candles, *Agnus Dei's*, &c. And how unlike is all this to the Religion of our Saviour, to that purity of Heart and Mind the Gospel exacts, and to those means of Sanctification, and methods of Piety and Vertue it prescribes? Whoever considers what Christian Religion is, can no more think these Observances Christian Worship, than he can mistake Popish Legends for the Acts of the Apostles.

II. Let us now consider what kind of Worship Christ has prescribed to his Disciples: And the general account we have of it 4 John 23, 24. *But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth, for the Father seeketh such to worship him: God is a spirit, and they that worship him, must worship him in spirit and in truth.* Now there are three things included in this description of Gospel-Worship: 1. That we must Worship God under the Notion of a Pure and Infinite Spirit. 2. That we must Worship him under the Character of a Father. 3. That we must Worship him with the Mind and Spirit.

First, We must Worship God under the Notion of a Pure and Infinite Spirit, who has now confined his peculiar Presence to no place, as he formerly did to the Temple at *Jerusalem*; for this was the present Dispute, Whether God would be Worshipped at the Temple at *Jerusalem*, or *Samaria*; as I observed above: In opposition to which, our Saviour tells the Woman, that God is a Spirit, and therefore not confined to any place; he is every-where, and present with us every-where, and may be worshipped every-where by devout and pious Souls: that though for Typical Reasons he had a Typical and Symbolical Presence under the *Jewish* Dispensation, yet this was not so agreeable to his Nature, who is a Spirit, and therefore he must not now be sought for in Houses of Wood and Stone.

And indeed the Reformation of the Divine Worship must begin in rectifying our Notions and Apprehensions of God; for such as we apprehend God to be, such a kind of Worship we shall pay him;

him; as is evident from the Rites and Ceremonies of the *Pagan* Worſhip, which was fitted to the Nature and Hiſtory of their Gods; for where there are no Inſtituted Rites of Worſhip, all mankind conclude, that the Nature of God is the beſt Rule of his Worſhip, for all Beings are beſt pleaſed with ſuch Honours, as are ſuitable to their Natures, and no Being can think himſelf Honoured by ſuch Actions as are a contradiction to his own Nature and Perfections.

Now if God will be Worſhipped more like a pure and infinite Spirit under the Goſpel, than he was under the Law; if this be the fundamental Principle of Goſpel-Worſhip, that God is a Spirit, and muſt be Worſhipped as a Spirit, I think it is plain, that nothing is more unlike a pure Spirit, then a material Image; nothing more unlike an infinite Spirit, which can have no ſhape or figure, then a finite and figured Image, made in the likeneſs of a man, or of any thing in Heaven and Earth; nothing more unlike an infinite Spirit, which is Life, and Mind, and Wiſdom, than a dead and ſenceleſs Image; and if under the Law, where God ſuited his Worſhip more to a Typical Diſpenſation than to his own Nature, he would not allow of the Worſhip of Images, much leſs is this an acceptable Worſhip to him under the Goſpel, where he will be Worſhipped as a pure Spirit, for there is nothing in the World more unlike a Living, Infinite, Omnipotent, Omniſcient Spirit, than a little piece of dead ſenceleſs figured Gold or Silver, Wood or Stone, whatever ſhape the Carver or Engraver pleaſe to give it, ſince God has none. Now would any man, who underſtands this, that God is a Spirit, and will under the Goſpel be Worſhipped as a Spirit, ſhould he go into many Popiſh Churches and Chappels, and ſee a vaſt number of Images and Pictures there, and People devoutly kneeling before them, ſuſpect that theſe were Chriſtian Oratories, or this Chriſtian Worſhip, unleſs he knew ſomething of the matter before? For there you ſhall find the Pictures of God the Father, and the ever Bleſſed Trinity, in different Forms and Repreſentations; the Pictures of the Bleſſed Virgin, and other Saints and Martyrs devoutly Adored and Worſhipped, and would any man gueſs, that this were to Worſhip

God:

God as a pure and infinite Spirit? A Spirit cannot be Painted, and then to Worſhip God as a Spirit, cannot ſignifie to look upon any Repreſentation of God, when we pray to him, which to be ſure cannot give us the Idea of an infinite Spirit. He who Worſhips God as a Spirit, can have no regard to Matter and Senſe, but muſt apply himſelf to God as to an infinite Mind, which no man can do, who gazes upon an Image, or contemplates God in the art and skill of a Painter; for to pray to God in an Image, and in the ſame thought to conſider him as a pure and infinite mind, is a contradiction; for though a man, who believes God to be a Spirit, may be ſo abſurd, as to worſhip him in an Image, yet an Image cannot repreſent a Spirit to him, and therefore either he muſt not think at all of the Image, and then methinks he ſhould not look on an Image, when he worſhips God, for that is apt to make him think of it; or if he does think of the Image, while his mind is filled with ſuch groſs and ſenſible repreſentations, it is impoſſible in the ſame act to addreſs to God, as to a pure inviſible, and infinite Spirit. Which ſhews how unfit and improper Images are in the Worſhip of God; for they muſt either be wholly uſeleſs, and ſuch as a man muſt not ſo much as look or think on, (which is very irreconcileable with that Worſhip, which is paid to them in the Church of *Rome*) or while he is intent upon a Picture or Image, his mind is diverted from the contemplation of a pure and infinite Spirit, and therefore cannot, and does not Worſhip God as a Spirit.

And the ſame is true of the Images of Saints and the Bleſſed Virgin: for though to makes Pictures of Men or Women, is no reproach to the Divine Nature, ſince they are not the Pictures or Images of God, who is a Spirit, but of thoſe Saints, whom they are intended to repreſent, yet if all Chriſtian Worſhip be the Worſhip of God, it is evident, that the Worſhip of Images, though they be not the Images of God, but of the Saints, can be no part of Chriſtian Worſhip, becauſe God muſt be Worſhipped as a Spirit, and therefore not by any Image whatſoever.

Now the Church of *Rome* will not pretend, that the Worſhip of Saints and their Images, is a diſtinct and ſeparate Worſhip from

from the Worſhip of God, but to juſtifie themſelves, they conſtantly affirm, that they Worſhip God in that Worſhip, which they pay to the Saints and their Images; for they know, that to do otherwiſe, would be to terminate their Worſhip upon Creatures, which they confeſs to be Idolatry, ſince all Religious Worſhip muſt terminate on God; and therefore ſhould they give any Religious Worſhip to Creatures diſtinct and ſeparate from that Worſhip they give to God, it were Idolatry upon their own principles.

Now if they Worſhip God in the Worſhip of Saints and their Images, then they Worſhip God in the Images of Saints, and that I think is to Worſhip him by Images: the Worſhip of a pure infinite and inviſible Spirit will admit of no Images, whether of God or Creatures, as the Objects or Mediums of Worſhip.

But it may be ſaid, that this is to graft our own Fancies and Imaginations upon Scripture; for though Chriſt does ſay, that God is a Spirit, and muſt be Worſhipped in Spirit, he does not ſay, that to Worſhip God in Spirit is not to Worſhip him by an Image; but to Worſhip God in Spirit, in our Saviour's Diſcourſe with the Woman of *Samaria*, is not oppoſed to Image-Worſhip, but to confining the Worſhip of God to a particular place, ſuch as the Temple at *Jeruſalem* and *Samaria* was; as I obſerved above. Now to this I anſwer:

1. To Worſhip God as a Spirit, does in the nature of the thing ſignifie this; for to Worſhip God by any material or ſenſible Repreſentations is not to Worſhip God as a Spirit; for an infinite Spirit cannot be repreſented by matter, nor by any ſhape and figure, becauſe it neither is material, nor has any figure.

2. If God will not have his peculiar Preſence confined to any place under the Goſpel, much leſs will he be Worſhipped by Images and Pictures, for it is not ſuch a contradiction to the nature of an infinite Spirit, to ſhew himſelf more peculiarly preſent in one place than in another, as it is to be Worſhipped by ſenſible Images and Pictures. Though God fills all places, there may be wiſe Reaſons, why he ſhould confine the Acts of Worſhip to ſome

ſome peculiar place, and ſuch Typical Reaſons there were for it under the Law, but there never can be any Reaſon, why a Spirit ſhould be Repreſented and Worſhipped by an Image, which is ſuch a contradiction and diſhonour to the nature of the Spirit; and therefore when God confined his Symbolical Preſence to the Temple at *Jeruſalem*, yet he ſtrictly forbad the Worſhip of Images, and much leſs then will he allow of Image-Worſhip, when he will not ſo much as have a Temple.

3. For we muſt obſerve farther, that what our Saviour here ſays, God is a Spirit, and will be Worſhipped in Spirit, is not a particular Direction, how to Worſhip God, but a general Rule to which the nature of our Worſhip muſt be conformed, and therefore it is our Rule, as far as the plain Reaſon of it extends. Under the Law they were not left to general Rules, but God determined the particular Rites and Ceremonies of his Worſhip himſelf; for under the Law God had not ſo plainly diſcovered his own nature to them, as he has done by his Son in the Goſpel. For *no man hath ſeen God at any time, but the only begotten ſon, who is in the boſom of the father, he hath declared him.* And therefore the nature of God was never made the Rule of Worſhip before. Thô God was as much a Spirit under the Law, as he is under the Goſpel, yet this was never aſſigned as a reaſon againſt Image-Worſhip, that God is a Spirit: but either that they ſaw no Likeneſs or Similitude in the Mountain, when God ſpake to them, 4 *Deut.* 15, 16. or that he is ſo great and glorious a Being, that nothing in the World is a fit Repreſentation of him: *To whom then will ye liken God? or what likeneſs will ye compare unto him? ---It is he that ſitteth upon the circle of the earth, and the inhabitants thereof are as graſhoppers, that ſtretcheth out the heavens as a curtain, and ſpreadeth them out as a tent to dwell in,* &c. But that God is a Spirit, who has no ſhape and figure, is a much better Argument againſt Image-Worſhip, than all this; but this God had not ſo plainly declared to them; and if God forbad the Worſhip of Images, when he thought fit to give no other reaſon for it, but that he had never appeared to them in any Likeneſs or Similitude, or that he was too great to be Repreſented;

40 Iſa. 18. &c.

we

we our ſelves may now judge, how unfit it is to Worſhip God by an Image, ſince our Saviour has declared, that he is a Spirit, who has no Likeneſs or Figure, and that now he expects to be Worſhipped by us as a Spirit, and therefore without any Image or ſenſible Repreſentation.

4. And yet ſome Learned men think, that our Saviour in theſe Words, had as well reſpect to the Worſhip of God by Images, as to his Worſhip in the Temple: for that he had reſpect to the Object as well as Place of Worſhip, is evident from what he adds, *ye worſhip ye know not what, we know what we worſhip, for ſalvation is of the Jews*; wherein he informs the Woman, that though ſhe inquired only of the place of Worſhip, the *Samaritans* were guilty of a greater fault than ſetting up the Temple at *Samaria* in oppoſition to the Temple at *Jeruſalem, viz.* in a falſe Object, or an Idolatrous manner of Worſhip, they Worſhipping a Dove as the Symbol and Repreſentation of God: and thus to Worſhip God in Spirit, is expreſly oppoſed to Worſhipping God by Images. 4 John 22.

5*ly*, However this comes much to one; for if God being a Spirit his Worſhip muſt not be confined to any place or Symbolical Preſence; then he muſt not be Worſhipped by an Image, for an Image is a Repreſentative Preſence of God, or of the Saints; for the uſe of Images is to repreſent that Being whom we Worſhip as preſent to us: and therefore if men conſider what they do, they go to Images, as to Divine Preſences, to Worſhip. Images, which are ſet up in Churches and Chappels for the Worſhip of God, or of the Saints, are confined to places, and make thoſe places as much appropriate and peculiar places of Worſhip, as the *Jewiſh* Temple was, excepting that the Temple was but one, and they are many. Heathen Temples were the Houſes of their Gods, or of their Images, which were the Preſence of their Gods; and if we muſt not appropriate the Preſence of God to any place, then we muſt not Worſhip him by Images, which are of no uſe but to repreſent God as ſenſibly preſent, with the Image, or in the place, where the Image is. If God be better Worſhipped before an Image, than without one, then the Worſhip of God is more confined to that place, where an Image is, than to thoſe places,

which have no Images. I cannot ſee how to avoid this, that if God muſt be Worſhipped by Images, than there muſt be appropriate places of Worſhip, *viz.* where the Image is, if there be no appropriate places of Worſhip under the Goſpel, like the Temple at *Jeruſalem*, then God muſt not be Worſhipped by Images; for an Image muſt be in ſome place, and if God muſt be Worſhipped at, or before his Image, then that is the proper and peculiar place of Worſhip, where his Image is; nay, though the Image be not fixt to any place, but be carried about with us, yet if we muſt Worſhip God by Images, the Image is not only the Object, but makes the place of Worſhip, for there we muſt Worſhip God, where his Image is, if we muſt Worſhip him before his Image. It is impoſſible to ſeparate the Notion of Image-Worſhip, from the Notion of a peculiar and appropriate place of Worſhip; for the Image determines the place, as the Preſence of the Object; does and as under the Goſpel we may Worſhip God any where, becauſe he is an infinite Spirit, and fills all places, and is equally preſent with all devout Worſhippers, where-ever they Worſhip him: So where the Image is Conſecrated for a Divine Preſence, it is not only the Object, but the peculiar place of Worſhip, becauſe God is peculiarly preſent there, or more acceptably worſhipped there, than where there is no Image. So that if a peculiar and appropriate place of worſhip be contrary to the notion of an infinite Spirit, the worſhip of Images is much more ſo, for beſides that they are groſs and corporeal repreſentations of a Spirit, they are Divine Preſences too, and appropriate places of worſhip.

Secondly, As God muſt be worſhipped under the notion of a Spirit, ſo under the character of a Father: as our Saviour expreſly tells us; *The hour cometh and now is, when the true worſhippers ſhall worſhip the Father in Spirit and truth, for the Father ſeeketh ſuch to worſhip him*, and therefore he taught his Diſciples to pray, *Our Father which art in heaven.* Under the Law God was worſhipped as a King, and that not ſo much as the King of the whole world, but as in a peculiar manner the King of *Iſrael*. *The Lord reigneth, let the people tremble, he ſitteth between the Cherubims* (in his Tem-

4 Joh. 23.

ple at Jeruſalem) *let the earth be moved. The Lord is great in Zi-* 99 Pſal. 1,
on, and he is high above all people. But under the Goſpel the pe- 2.
culiar character of God is a Father, and that not only as he is the maker of all men, and ſo the Father of all, but as he is the Father of Chriſt, and in him the Father of all Chriſtians. Now this makes a vaſt difference in our worſhip, from what is daily practiſed in the Church of *Rome.* For,

1. When we pray to God as *our Father,* we muſt pray to him as dwelling in Heaven: as our Saviour teaches us to ſay, *Our Father, which art in Heaven.* For as a Father, Heaven is his Houſe and Habitation; *in my Fathers Houſe are many manſions,* that is, in 14 John 2.
in Heaven, which is his Houſe as a Father, as the Temple at *Jeruſalem,* was his Palace conſidered as the King of *Iſrael*; and this is one reaſon our Saviour intimates, why the preſence of God ſhall no longer be confined to any particular place or Temple, becauſe he ſhall be worſhipped as the univerſal Father, not as the King of *Jury*; Now when he is to be worſhipped as a Father from all parts of the world, he muſt have ſuch a Throne and preſence to which all the World may equally reſort, and that can be no other then his Throne in Heaven, whither we may ſend up our Prayers from all Corners of the Earth; but had he confined his Preſence to any place on Earth, as he did to the Temple of *Jeruſalem,* the reſt of the World muſt have been without God's peculiar Preſence, could have had no Temple nor place of Worſhip, but at ſuch a diſtance that they could never have come at it: for though God fills all places, it is a great abſurdity to talk of more Symbolical Preſences of God than one: for a Symbolical Preſence confines the unlimited Preſence of God to a certain place in order to certain ends, as to receive the Worſhip, that is paid him, and to anſwer the Prayers, that are made to him; and to have more than One ſuch Preſence as this, is like having more Gods than One.

So that all our Worſhip under the Goſpel, muſt be directed to God in Heaven; and that is a plain argument, that we muſt not Worſhip God in Images on Earth, for they neither can repreſent to us the Majeſty of God in Heaven, nor is God preſent with the Image to receive our Worſhip there: if God muſt now be Wor-

ſhipped as dwelling in Heaven, it is certain there can be no Object of our Worſhip on Earth; for though God fill all places with his Preſence, yet he will be Worſhipped only as ſitting on his Throne in Heaven; and then I am ſure he muſt not be Worſhipped in an Image on Earth, for that is not his Throne in Heaven. This the Mercy-ſeat in the Holy of Holies was an Emblem of; for the Holy of Holies in the *Jewiſh* Temple, did ſignifie Heaven, and the Mercy-ſeat covered with Cherubims, ſignified the Throne of God in Heaven, whither we muſt lift up our Eyes and Hearts when we pray to him: for though it is indifferent from what place we put up our Prayers to God, while we have regard to the External Decency of Religious Worſhip, yet it is not indifferent whither we direct our Prayers; for we muſt direct our Prayers
4 Heb. 16. *to the throne of grace, if we would obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need.* Now the Throne of Grace is only in Heaven, whither Chriſt is aſcended to make Atonement for us; for he is the true Propitiatory or Mercy-ſeat: And therefore if to direct our Prayers to God, to his Picture or Image, or to the Images of the Virgin *Mary*, or any other Saints, did not provoke God to jealouſie, yet it would do us no good, unleſs ſuch Images are God's Throne of Grace, for all other Prayers are loſt, which are not directed to God on his Throne of Grace, where alone he will receive our Petitions. If a Prince would receive no Petitions but what were preſented to him ſitting on ſuch a Throne, all men would be ſenſible how vain a thing it were to offer any Petition to him elſe-where. And yet thus it is here: A Sinner dare not, muſt not approach the Preſence of God, but only on his Mercy-ſeat and Throne of Grace; for any where elſe our God is a Conſuming Fire, a Juſt and a Terrible Judge: now God has but one Throne of Grace, and that is in Heaven, as the Mercy-ſeat was in the Holy of Holies, which was a Type of Heaven; thither Chriſt aſcended with his Bloud to ſprinkle the Mercy-ſeat, and to cover it with a Cloud of Incenſe, which are the Prayers of the Saints, as the High-Prieſt did once a Year in the Typical Holy Place. Which is a plain proof, that all our Prayers muſt be immediately directed to God in Heaven, where Chriſt dwells, who

is

is our true Propitiatory and Mercy-ſeat, who has ſprinkled the Throne of God with his own Bloud, and has made it a Throne of Grace, and where he offers up our Prayers as Incenſe to God.

2. To Worſhip God as our Father, ſignifies to Worſhip him only in the Name and Mediation of his Son Jeſus Chriſt: for he is our Father only in Jeſus Chriſt, and we can call him Father in no other Name. By the right of Creation he is our Lord, and our Judge, but he is the Father of Sinners only by Adoption and Grace, and we are Adopted only in Chriſt: ſo that if Chriſtian Worſhip be the Worſhip of God as a Father, then we muſt pray to God in no other Name, but of his own Eternal Son: The Virgin *Mary*, though ſhe were the Mother of Chriſt, yet does not make God our Father; and then no other Saint, I preſume, will pretend to it: which ſhews what a contradiction the Invocation of Saints is to the Nature of Chriſtian Worſhip, and how unavailable to obtain our requeſts of God. If we muſt Worſhip God only as our Father, then we muſt Worſhip him only in the Name of his Son, for he owns himſelf our Father in no other Name; and if he will hear our Prayers, and anſwer our humble Petitions only as a Father, then he will hear only thoſe Prayers which are made to him in the Name of his Son: How great Favourites ſoever the Bleſſed Virgin and other Saints may be, if God hear Prayers only as a Father, it is to no purpoſe to pray to God in their Names, for he hears us not.

3. To Worſhip God as a Father, ſignifies to pray to him with the humble aſſurance and confidence of Children: This is *the ſpirit of adoption, whereby we cry Abba Father.* For becauſe *ye are ſons, God hath ſent forth the ſpirit of his Son into your hearts, crying Abba Father.* A dutiful Son does not queſtion his Father's good will to him, nor readineſs to hear and anſwer all his juſt requeſts, he depends upon the kindneſs of his Father, and his intereſt and relation to him, and ſeeks for no other Friends and Favourites to recommend him: And upon this account alſo the Invocation of Saints is a contradiction to the Goſpel-Spirit of Prayer, to that Spirit of Adoption, which teaches us to cry *Abba Father*; for ſurely thoſe have not the hope, and aſſurance, and *πίστις* of Children,

8 Rom. 15. 4 Gal. 6.

dren, who dare not go to their Father themſelves, but muſt ſend their Petitions to him by the hands of Favourites and Interceſſors. To pray to God in the Name of Chriſt, is onely to pray to him as Sons, for it is in his Name only that he owns us for Sons; and this is the true Spirit of Adoption, in the Name and Mediation of Chriſt, to go to God, as Children to a Father; but to pray to him in any other Name, how powerful ſoever, is not to go to him as a Father, but as to our Lord and King, who muſt be Addreſſed to by the Mediation of ſome great Favourites. To pray to God in any other Name, which does not make us his Sons, is to diſtruſt our Relation to him, as our Father in Chriſt; and this is contrary to the Spirit of Adoption, which teaches us to call God Father, and gives us that aſſurance of his Fatherly goodneſs to us in Chriſt, that we need and deſire no other Advocates.

Thirdly, To Worſhip God in Spirit, is to Worſhip him with our Mind and Spirit; for that is moſt agreeable to the Nature of God, who is a Spirit. God cannot be Worſhipped but by a reaſonable Creature, and yet a Beaſt may Worſhip God as well as a Man, who Worſhips without any act of Reaſon and Underſtanding, or devout Affections. To pray to God without knowing what we ſay, when neither our Underſtandings nor Affections can joyn in our Prayers, is ſo abſurd a Worſhip of a pure Mind, that Tranſubſtantiation it ſelf is not more contrary to Senſe, than Prayers in an unknown Tongue are to the Eſſential Reaſon and Nature of Worſhip. I ſuppoſe no man will ſay, that to pray to God, or praiſe him in words which we do not underſtand, is to Worſhip God in Spirit, unleſs he thinks that a Parrot may be taught to pray in the Spirit: What difference is there between a man's not ſpeaking, and ſpeaking what he does not underſtand? Juſt ſo much difference there is between not praying, and praying what we do not underſtand: and he honours God to the full as much, who does not pray at all, as he who prays he knows not what, and, I am ſure, he affronts him a great deal leſs: However, if Chriſtian Worſhip be to worſhip God in Spirit, Prayers in an unknown Tongue, in which the Mind and Spirit cannot be concerned, is no Chriſtian Worſhip.

SECT.

Sect. IV.

Concerning the Reformation and Improvement of Humane Nature, by the Goſpel of CHRIST.

4. ANother principal end and intention of the Goſpel, was to cure the Degeneracy of Mankind, and to advance Humane Nature to its utmoſt Perfection: for as Man fell from his original Happineſs, by falling from the purity and integrity of his Nature, ſo there was no reſtoring him to his loſt Happineſs, much leſs no advancing him to a more perfect ſtate of Happineſs, not to an earthly, but to an heavenly Paradiſe, without changing and transforming his Nature, and renewing him after the Image of God. And therefore our very entrance into Chriſtianity, is a new Birth: *Except a man be born of water, and of the ſpirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God: That which is born of the fleſh is fleſh, and that which is born of the ſpirit is ſpirit.* And ſuch a man is called a new Creature; and a Chriſtian Life is *a newneſs of Life*, and *living after the Spirit, and walking after the Spirit:* and this new Nature is the *Divine Nature*, the *Image of God*, the *new man, which after God is created in righteouſneſs and true holineſs, which is renewed in knowledge after the Image of him that created him.* 3 John 5,6. 8 Rom. 1. 4 Eph. 24. 3 Coloſ 10.

So that there are two things, wherein this new Nature conſiſts, *Knowledge*, and *Righteouſneſs, or true Holineſs*, and I doubt it will appear, that the Church of *Rome* is no great Friend to either.

I. Knowledge: Now I ſuppoſe neither the Church of *Rome*, nor any one for her, will pretend that ſhe is any great Friend to Knowledge: She is ſo horribly afraid of Hereſie, that ſhe endeavours to nurſe men up in Ignorance of their Religion, for fear they ſhould prove Hereticks; and indeed ſhe has ſome reaſon for it: for the Church of *Rome* was never ſo Triumphant as in the moſt ignorant and barbarous Ages; but as Knowledge broke in upon the World, ſo men turned Hereticks apace.

If there be any knowing Papiſts (and it would be very hard, if there ſhould be none) they are not beholding to their Church for

for it, which deprives them of all the means of Knowledge: for she will not allow them to believe their Senses, which is one way of knowing things, and the most certain we have: and yet she commands us to believe Transubstantiation, which no man can do who believes his Senses: and if I must not believe my Senses in so plain a matter, as what is Bread and Wine, I know no reason I have to believe them in any thing, and then there is an end of all Knowledge, that depends on Sense; as the proof of the Christian Religion itself does: for Miracles are a sensible proof, and if I must not trust my Senses, I cannot rely on Miracles, because I cannot know, whether there be any such thing as a real Miracle.

The Church of *Rome* also forbids men the use of Reason in matters of Religion, will not allow men to judge for themselves, nor to examine the Reasons of their Faith, and what knowledge any man can have without exercising his Reason and Understanding, I cannot guess; for to know without understanding sounds to me like a contradiction.

She also denies Christians the use of the Bible, which is the only means to know the revealed Will of God: and when men must neither believe their Senses, nor trust their Reason, nor read the Scripture, it is easie to guess what knowing and understanding Christians, they must needs be.

But it may be said, that notwithstanding this, the Church of *Rome* does Instruct her Children in the true Catholick Faith, though she will not venture them to judge for themselves, nor to read the Scriptures, which is the effect of her great care of them, to keep them Orthodox: for when men trust to their own fallible Reasons, and private Interpretations of Scripture, it is a great hazard that they do not fall into one Heresie or other: but when men are taught the pure Catholick Faith without any danger of Error and Heresie, is not this much better, then to suffer them to reason and judge for themselves, when it is great odds, but they will judge wrong.

Now this would be something indeed, did the Church of *Rome* take care to Instruct them in all necessary Doctrines, and to teach

teach nothing, but what is true, and could ſuch men, who thus tamely receive the dictates of the Church, be ſaid to know and to underſtand their Religion. How far the Church of *Rome* is from doing the firſt, all Chriſtians in the world are ſenſible but themſelves, but that is not our preſent diſpute; for though the Church of *Rome* did inſtruct her people into the true Chriſtian Faith, yet ſuch men cannot be ſaid to know and underſtand their Religion; and to ſecure the Faith by deſtroying knowledge, is a direct contradiction to the deſign of the Goſpel, which is to make men wiſe and underſtanding Chriſtians. For no man underſtands his Religion, who does not in ſome meaſure know the reaſons of his Faith, and judge whether they be ſufficient or not; who knows not how to diſtinguiſh between Truth and Error, who has no Rule to go by, but muſt take all upon truſt, and the credit of his Teachers; who believes whatever he is told, and learns his Creed, as School boys do their Grammar, without underſtanding it: This is not an active, but a kind of paſſive knowledge; ſuch men receive the impreſſion, that is made on them, as wax does, and underſtand no more of the matter; now will any one call this the knowledge and underſtanding of a man, or the Diſcipline of a Child?

But ſuppoſe there were ſome men ſo dull and ſtupid, that they could never riſe higher; that they are not capable of inquiring into the reaſons of things, but muſt take up their Religion upon truſt; yet will any man ſay, that this is the utmoſt perfection of knowledge, that any Chriſtian muſt aim at? is this the meaning of *the word of God dwelling in us richly in all wiſdom?* is 3 Col. 16.
this the way to give an anſwer to any one, *who asks a reaſon of the hope that is in us?* the perfection of Chriſtian knowledge is a great and glorious attainment; to underſtand the ſecrets of God's Laws, thoſe depths and myſteries of wiſdom and goodneſs in the œconomy of Mans Salvation; to ſee the Analogy between the Law and the Goſpel, how the Legal Types and ancient Prophecies received their accompliſhment in Chriſt, how far the Goſpel has advanced us above the ſtate of Nature, and the Law of *Moſes*; what an admirable deſign it was to redeem the world by the

Incarnation and death and ſufferings and interceſſion of the Son of God; what myſteries of Wiſdom and Goodneſs the Goſpel contains; the knowledge of which is not only the perfection of our underſtandings, but raiſes and ennobles our minds, and tranſforms us into the Divine Image: Theſe things were revealed, that they might be known, not that they ſhould be concealed from the world, or neglected and deſpiſed; but this is a knowledge, which cannot be attained without diligent and laborious inquiries, without uſing all the reaſon and underſtanding we have, in ſearching the Scriptures, and all other helps which God has afforded us.

Now if Chriſtian Knowledge be ſomething more than to be able to repeat our Creed, and to believe it upon the authority of our Teachers, if the Goſpel of our Saviour was intended to advance us to a true manly knowledge, Chriſt and the Church of *Rome* ſeem to have two very different deſigns, our Lord in cauſing the Goſpel to be wrote and publiſht to the world, the other in concealing it as much as ſhe can, and ſuffering no body to read it without her leave, as a dangerous Book, which is apt to make men Hereticks; for it is hard to conceive, that the Goſpel was written, that it might not be read, and then one would gueſs, that he by whoſe authority and inſpiration the Goſpel was written, and thoſe by whoſe authority it is forbid to be read, are not of a mind in this matter.

1. This I think in the firſt place is an evident proof, that to forbid Chriſtian people to read and ſtudy and meditate on the word of God, is no Goſpel Doctrine, unleſs not to read the Bible, be a better way to improve in all true Chriſtian knowledge and wiſdom, than to read it: for that is the duty of Chriſtians, to grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt; this was one great end of publiſhing the Goſpel to the world, to enlighten and improve mens underſtandings, as well as to govern their Lives; and though we grant, men may be taught the principles of Chriſtian Religion, as Children are, without reading the Bible, yet if they will but grant, that ſtudying and meditating on the holy Scriptures, is the beſt and only

ly way to improve in all true Chriſtian knowledge, this ſhows how contrary this prohibition of reading the Scriptures is to the great deſign of the Goſpel, to perfect our knowledge in the myſteries of Chriſt.

2*ly*. This is a mighty preſumption alſo againſt Tranſubſtantiation, that it is no Goſpel Doctrine, becauſe it overthrows the very Fundamental Principles of Knowledge, which is a direct contradiction to the deſign of the Goſpel, to advance Divine Knowledge to the utmoſt perfection it can attain in this world.

Whoever has his eyes in his head muſt confeſs, that the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation is contrary to Senſe; for were our ſenſes to be Judges of this matter, they would pronounce the Bread and Wine after Conſecration, to be Bread and Wine ſtill; and therefore what ever reaſon there may be to believe it not to be Bread and Wine, but Fleſh and Blood, yet it muſt be confeſſed, that our Faith in this matter contradicts our ſenſe; for even Roman Catholick Eyes and Noſes and Hands, can ſee and feel and ſmell nothing but Bread and Wine: and if to our ſenſes it appears to be nothing but Bread and Wine, thoſe who believe it to be the Natural Body and Blood of Chriſt, believe contrary to what they ſee.

Thus there is nothing more contrary to the natural notions we have of things, than the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation: for if this Doctrine be true, then the ſame individual body of Chriſt is in Heaven at the right hand of God, and on ten thouſand Altars, at a great diſtance from each other on earth, at the ſame time. Then a humane Body is contracted into the compaſs of a Wafer, or rather ſubſiſts without any dimenſions, *without extenſion of parts, and independent on place.*

Now not to diſpute, whether this be true or falſe, my only inquiry at preſent is, whether this do not contradict thoſe natural notions all men have of the properties of a Humane Body: let a man ſearch his own mind, and try, whether he find any ſuch notion of a Body, as can be preſent at more places than one at the ſame time, a Body that is without Extenſion, nay that has parts without Extenſion, and therefore without any diſtinction too:

for the parts of an Organical Body muſt be diſtinguiſhed by place and ſituation, which cannot be, if they have no Extenſion; a Body, which is preſent without occupying a place, or being in a place: if we have no ſuch natural notion of a Body, as I am ſure I have not, and I believe no man elſe has, then let Tranſubſtantiation be true or falſe, it is contrary to the natural notions of our minds, which is all I am at preſent concerned for: Thus let any man try, if he have any notion of an accident ſubſiſting without any ſubſtance, of a white and ſoft and hard nothing; of the ſame body, which is extended and not extended, which is in a place, and not in a place at the ſame time: for in Heaven, I ſuppoſe, they will grant, the Body of Chriſt fills a place, and has the juſt dimenſions and proportions of a Humane Body, and at the ſame time in the Hoſt the very ſame body is preſent, without any extenſion; and independent on place; that is, the ſame body at the ſame time is extended and not extended, fills a place and fills no place, which, I ſuppoſe, they mean by being *Independent on place*; now is and is not, is a contradiction to natural Reaſon, and I have no other natural notion of it, but as of a contradiction, both parts of which cannot be true. Let us then briefly examine, whether it be likely, that Tranſubſtantiation, which contradicts the evidence of ſenſe, and the natural notions of our Minds, ſhould be a Goſpel Doctrine, conſidering the Goſpel as the moſt Divine and excellent Knowledge, and moſt perfective of Humane underſtandings. For,

1. This Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation, is ſo far from perfecting our Knowledge, that it deſtroys the very Principles of all Humane Knowledge: All natural knowledge is owing either to Senſe or Reaſon, and Tranſubſtantiation contradicts both, and whoever believes it, muſt believe contrary to his Senſes and Reaſon, which if it be to believe like a Catholick, I am ſure, is not to believe like a man; if the perfection of knowledge conſiſt in contradicting our own Faculties, Tranſubſtantiation is the moſt perfect knowledge in the world; but however, I ſuppoſe no man will ſay, that this is the natural perfection of knowledge, which overthrows the moſt natural notions we have of things: and yet

2. All

2. All ſupernatural Knowledge muſt of neceſſity be graſted upon that which is natural; for we are capable of revealed and ſupernatural Knowledge, only as we are by nature reaſonable Creatures, and deſtroy Reaſon, and Beaſts are as fit to be preached too as Men: And yet to contradict the plain and moſt natural notions of our minds, is to deſtroy Humane Reaſon, and to leave Mankind no Rule or Principle to know and judge by. No man can know any thing, which contradicts the Principles of Natural Knowledge, becauſe he has only theſe natural Principles to know by; and therefore however his Faith may be improved by it, he forfeits his natural Knowledge, and has no ſupernatural Knowledge in the room of it: For how can a man know and underſtand that which is contrary to all the natural Knowledge and Underſtanding he has? There may be ſome revealed Principles of Knowledge ſuper-added to natural Principles, and theſe things we may know to be ſo, though we have no natural Notion of them, and this perfects, becauſe it enlarges our Knowledge; as the Knowledge of three Divine Perſons ſuper-added to the natural Belief of one Supreme God; which does not overthrow the belief of one God, but only acquaints us, that there are three Divine Perſons in the Unity of the Godhead, which, whatever difficulty there may be in apprehending it, yet overthrows no natural Notion: this is an improvement of Knowledge, becauſe we know all we did before, and we know ſomething more, that as there is one God, ſo there are three Perſons, who are this one God; and though we have no natural Notion of this, how three Perſons are one God, becauſe we know no diſtinction between Perſon and Eſſence in Finite Beings, yet we have no natural Notion, that there cannot be more Perſons than one in an Infinite Eſſence; and therefore this may be known by Revelation, becauſe there is no natural Notion againſt it. But now I can never know that which is contrary to all the Principles of Knowledge I have; ſuch men may believe it, who think it a Vertue to believe againſt Knowledge: Who can believe that to be true, which they know to be falſe? For whatever is contrary to the plain and neceſſary Principles of Reaſon, which all Mankind agree in, I know muſt be

be false, if my Faculties be true, and if my Faculties be not true, then I can know nothing at all, neither by Reason nor Revelation, because I have no true Faculties to know with: Revelation is a Principle of Knowledge as well as Faith, when it does not contradict our natural Knowledge of things, for God may teach us that which Nature does not teach; and thus Revelation improves, enlarges, and perfects Knowledge: in such cases Faith serves instead of natural Knowledge, the Authority of the Revelation instead of the natural Notions and Idea's of our Minds; but I can never know that by Revelation which contradicts my natural Knowledge; which would be not only to know that, which I have no natural Knowledge of, which is the knowledge of Faith, but to know that by Revelation, which by Reason and Nature I know cannot be; which is to know that, which I know cannot be known, because I know it cannot be:

So that Transubstantiation, which contradicts all the evidence of Sence and Reason, is not the Object of any Humane Knowledge, and therefore cannot be a Gospel-Revelation, which is to improve and perfect, not to destroy Humane Knowledge: I can never know it, because it contradicts all the Notions of my Mind; and I can never believe it without denying the truth of my Faculties, and no Revelation can prove my Faculties to be false; for I can never be so certain of the truth of any Revelation, as I am, that my Faculties are true; and could I be perswaded, that my Faculties are not true, but deceive me in such things, as I judge most certain and evident, then I can no more believe them as to any Revelation, than I can as to their natural Reasonings, for the same Faculties must judge of both, and if the Faculty be false, I can trust its judgment in neither.

3*ly*, The Doctrine of Transubstantiation destroys all possible certainty, what the true sence and interpretation of Scripture is, and thereby overthrows all supernatural Knowledge. The Scripture we know is Expounded to very different and contrary Sences, and made to countenance the most monstrous and absurd Doctrines; Witness all the ancient Heresies which have been Fathered on the Scriptures. Now what way have we to confute

these

theſe Hereſies, but to ſhew, either that the words of Scripture will not bare ſuch a ſence, or at leaſt do not neceſſarily require it; that ſuch an Interpretation is contrary to Senſe, to Reaſon, to the natural Notions we have of God, and therefore is in itſelf abſurd and impoſſible? But if Tranſubſtantiation be a Goſpel-Doctrine, I deſire any Papiſt, among all the ancient Hereſies, to pick out any Doctrine more abſurd and impoſſible, more contrary to Senſe and Reaſon, than the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation is; and then it is no Argument againſt any Doctrine, or any Expoſition of Scripture, that it is abſurd and impoſſible, contrary to Senſe and Reaſon, for ſo Tranſubſtantiation is; and if we may believe one abſurd Doctrine, we may believe five hundred, how abſurd ſoever they be: And then what defence has any man againſt the moſt monſtrous Corruptions of the Chriſtian Faith? Is this the way to improve Knowledge, to deſtroy all the certain marks and characters of Truth and Error, and to leave no Rule to judge by? If the deſign of the Goſpel was to improve our Minds by a knowing and underſtanding Faith, Tranſubſtantiation, which overthrows the certainty both of natural and revealed Knowledge, can be no Goſpel-Doctrine.

3. The Authority of an infallible Judge, whom we muſt believe in every thing, without examining the reaſons of what he affirms, nay, though he teaches ſuch Doctrines as appear to us moſt expreſly contrary to Senſe, and Reaſon, and Scripture, is no Goſpel-Doctrine, becauſe it is not the way to make men wiſe and underſtanding Chriſtians, which is the great deſign of the Goſpel, for to ſuſpend the exerciſe of Reaſon and Judgment, is not the way to improve mens Knowledge: an infallible Teacher, and an infallible Rule do indeed mightily contribute to the improvement of Knowledge; but ſuch an infallible Judge, as the Church of *Rome* boaſts of, can only make men ignorant and ſtupid Believers: For there is a vaſt difference between an infallible Teacher, and an infallible Judge, which few men obſerve, at leaſt have not well explained; for an infallible Teacher is onely an external Proponent, and while men only teach and inſtruct, how infallible ſoever they are, every man is at liberty to uſe his own Reaſon

ſon and Judgment; for though the Teacher be infallible, he that learns muſt uſe his own Reaſon and Judgment, unleſs a man can learn without it: But now an infallible Judge is not contented to teach and inſtruct, which is an appeal to the Reaſon of Mankind, but he uſurps the office of every mans private Reaſon and Judgment, and will needs judge for all Mankind, as if he were *an Univerſal Soul, an Univerſal Reaſon and Judgment*, that no man had any Soul, any Reaſon or Judgment but himſelf: for if every man has a private Reaſon and Judgment of his own, ſurely every man muſt have a right to the private exerciſe of it; that is, to judge for himſelf; and then there can be no ſuch univerſal Judge, who muſt be that to every man, which in other caſes his own private Reaſon and Judgment is, which is to un-Soul all Mankind in matters of Religion. And therefore though there have been a great many infallible Teachers, as *Moſes* and the Prophets, Chriſt and his Apoſtles, yet none ever pretended to be infallible Judges, but the Church of *Rome*; that is, none ever pretended to deny People a liberty of judging for themſelves, or ever exacted from them an univerſal ſubmiſſion to their infallible Judgment without exerciſing any act of Reaſon and Judgment themſelves. I am ſure Chriſt and his Apoſtles left People to the exerciſe of their own Reaſon and Judgment, and require it of them; they were infallible Teachers, but they did not judge for all Mankind, but left every man to judge for himſelf, as every man muſt and ought, and as every man will do, who has any Reaſon and Judgment of his own: but an infallible Judge, who pretends to judge for all men, treats Mankind like Bruits, who have no reaſonable Souls of their own.

But you'll ſay, this diſtinction between an infallible Teacher and an infallible Judge, is very nice and curious, but ſeems to have nothing in it; for does not he who teaches infallibly, judge infallibly too? And muſt I not ſubmit my private Judgment, which all men allow to be fallible, to a publick infallible Judgment, which I know to be infallible? If I know that I may be deceived, and that ſuch a man cannot be deceived, is it not reaſonable for me to be governed by his Judgment, rather than my own?

I anſwer, All this is certainly true as any demonſtration, but then it is to be conſidered, that I cannot be ſo certain of any man's Infallibility, as to make him my Infallible Judge, in whoſe Judgment I muſt acquieſce, without exerciſing any Reaſon or Judgment of my own: and the reaſon is plain, becauſe I cannot know that any man teaches infallibly, unleſs I am ſure that he teaches nothing that is contrary to any natural or revealed Law. Whoever does ſo, is ſo far from being Infallible, that he actually errs; and whether he does ſo, I cannot know, unleſs I may judge of his Doctrine by the Light of Nature, and by Revelation: and therefore though there may be an Infallible Teacher, there never can be any Infallible Judge, to whom I muſt ſubmit my own Reaſon and Judgment, becauſe I muſt judge of his Doctrine my ſelf, before I can know that he is Infallible.

As for inſtance, when *Moſes* appeared as a Prophet and a Lawgiver to the Children of *Iſrael*, there was no written Law, but only the Law of Nature; and therefore thoſe great Miracles he wrought, gave authority to his Laws, becauſe he contradicted no neceſſary Law of Nature: but had any other perſon at that time wrought as many Miracles as *Moſes* did, and withal taught the Worſhip of many Gods, either ſuch as the *Ægyptians*, or any other Nations worſhipped at that time, this had been reaſon enough to have rejected him as a falſe Prophet, becauſe it is contrary to the natural Worſhip of one Supream God, which the Light of Nature teaches.

When Chriſt appeared, there was a written Law, the Writings of *Moſes* and the Prophets, and all the Miracles he wrought could not have proved him a true Prophet, had he contradicted the Scriptures of the Old Teſtament; and therefore his Doctrine was to be examined by them, and accordingly he appeals to *Moſes* and the Prophets to bear teſtimony to his Perſon and Doctrine, and exhorts them to ſearch the Scriptures, which gave teſtimony to him: and how the Miracles he wrought gave authority to any new Revelations he made of God's Will to the World, ſince he did not contradict the old. The Law of Nature, and the Laws of *Moſes*, were the Laws of God; and God cannot contra-

dict himſelf: and therefore the Doctrine of all new Prophets, even of Chriſt himſelf, was to be examined, and is to be examined to this day, by the Law and the Prophets; and therefore though he was certainly an Infallible Teacher, yet men were to judge of his Doctrine, before they believed him; and he did not require them to lay aſide their Reaſon and Judgment, and ſubmit to his Infallible Authority, without Examination.

So that all this while, there could be no Infallible Judge to whom all men were bound to ſubmit their own private Reaſon and Judgment, and to receive all their Dictates as divine Oracles, without Examination; becauſe they could not know them to be ſuch Infallible Teachers, till they had examined their Doctrine by the Light of Nature and the Law of *Moſes*: and we cannot to this day know that *Moſes* and Chriſt were true Prophets, but in the ſame way.

Since the writing of the New Teſtament, there is a farther Teſt of an Infallible Teacher, if there be any ſuch in the world; that he neither contradicts the Light of Nature, nor the true intent of the Law of *Moſes*, nor alter or add to the Goſpel of Chriſt; and therefore there can be no Infallible Judge, becauſe be he never ſo Infallible, we can never know that he is ſo, but by the agreement of his Doctrine with the Principles of Reaſon, with the Law and the Prophets, and with the Goſpel of Chriſt; and therefore muſt examine his Doctrine by theſe Rules, and therefore muſt judge for our ſelves, and not ſuffer any man to judge for us, upon a pretence of his Infallibility.

Could I know that any man were Infallible, without judging of his Doctrine, then indeed there were ſome reaſon to believe all that he ſays, without any inquiry or examination; but this never was, never can be: and therefore though there may be an Infallible Teacher, there can be no Infallible Judge to whom I muſt ſubmit my own Reaſon and Judgment, without asking any Queſtions. Which by the way ſhews, how ridiculous that Sophiſm is, *The Church has not erred, becauſe ſhe is Infallible*, when it is impoſſible for me to know ſhe is Infallible, till by examining her Doctrine by an Infallible Rule I know, that ſhe has not erred.

And

And the truth is, it is well there can be no Infallible Judge; for if there were, it would ſuſpend and ſilence the Reaſon and Judgment of all Mankind: and what a knowing Creature would Man be in matters of Religion, when he muſt not reaſon, and muſt not judge? juſt as knowing as a man can be without exerciſing any Reaſon and Judgment. And therefore not only the reaſon and nature of the thing proves, that there can be no Infallible Judge, but the deſign of Chriſt to advance humane Nature to the utmoſt perfection of Reaſon and Underſtanding in this World, proves that he never intended there ſhould be any: for to take away the exerciſe of Reaſon and private Judgment, is not the way to make men wiſe and knowing Chriſtians; and if Chriſt allows us to judge for our ſelves, there can be no Infallible Judge, whoſe Office it ſhall be to judge for us all.

4*ly*. To pretend the Scripture to be an obſcure or imperfect Rule, is a direct contradiction to the deſign of the Goſpel to improve and perfect Knowledge: for if the Scripture be ſo obſcure in the eſſential matters of Faith and Chriſtian knowledge, that we cannot have any certainty what the true ſence and interpretation of it is, without an Infallible Judge, then the Scriptures cannot improve our knowledge, becauſe we cannot know what they are, we cannot underſtand their meaning, and therefore can learn nothing from them.

Yes you'll ſay, we may know their meaning, when they are expounded to us by an Infallible Judge: though the Scriptures are ſo obſcure, that we cannot underſtand them without an Infallible Judge, yet we may certainly learn what the ſence of Scripture is from ſuch a Judge.

Now in anſwer to this, I obſerve, that though ſuch an Infallible Judge ſhould determine the ſenſe of all obſcure Texts of Scripture, (which neither the Pope nor Church of *Rome* have ever done) yet this would not be to underſtand the Scriptures, or to learn from the Scriptures, but only to rely on this Infallible Judge for the ſenſe of Scripture: To underſtand the Scriptures, is to be able to give a reaſon, why I expound Scripture to ſuch a ſenſe, as that the words ſignifie ſo, that the circumſtan-

ces of the place, and the context and coherence of the words require it; that the analogy of Faith, and the reason and nature of things, will either justifie such an interpretation, or admit no other: and an Expositor, who can thus open our Understandings, and not only tell us what the sense of Scripture is, but make us see, that this is the true sense and interpretation of it, does indeed make us understand the Scripture. Thus Christ himself did, when he was risen from the dead, *He opened their understandings, that they might understand the Scriptures*, 24 Luke 45. But to be told that this is the true sence of Scripture, and that we must believe this is the sense, though we can see no reason why it should be thus expounded, nay, though all the Reason we have tells us, that it ought not to be thus expounded, no man will say, that this is to understand the Scriptures, but to believe the Judge: No man can learn any thing from a Book, which he does not and cannot understand; and if men neither do nor can understand the Scriptures, it is certain, they can learn nothing from them: an Infallible Judge would teach as well without the Scriptures as with them, and indeed somewhat better, because then no man could have a pretence to contradict him; and therefore if this be true, the holy Scripture deserves all those contemptible Characters which the *Romanists* have given it; for it is so far from improving and perfecting our knowledge, that it self cannot be known, and therefore is good for nothing. So that the obscurity of the Scripture makes it wholly useless to the great ends and purposes of the Christian Religion, *viz.* to improve and perfect the knowledge of Mankind in the necessary and essential Doctrines of Faith, and therefore this can be no Gospel-Doctrine, because it makes the Gospel it self, considered as written, of no use.

Thus if the Scripture be an imperfect Rule, as the *Romanists* affirm, that it does not teach us the whole mind and will of God, but that we must learn even some necessary Doctrines of Faith from unwritten Traditions, which no body has the keeping of but the Church of *Rome*: This I say contradicts the great design of the Gospel, which is to improve and perfect knowledge; for an

an imperfect Rule of Faith is, I think, as bad as no Rule at all, becauſe we can never truſt it.

If you ſay, that though the Scripture in it ſelf be an imperfect Rule, yet we have a perfect Rule, becauſe the defects of the Scripture are ſupplied by unwritten Traditions; and therefore we have the whole Goſpel and all the Chriſtian knowledge delivered down to us, either in the written or unwritten Rule. I anſwer,

1. If the Scriptures be an imperfect Rule, then all Chriſtians have not a perfect Rule, becauſe they have not the keeping of unwritten Traditions, and know not what they are, and never can know what they are, till the Church is pleaſed to tell them; and it ſeems, it was a very great while, before the Church thought fit to do it. For ſuppoſe that all the new Articles of the Council of *Trent*, which are not contained in Scripture, were unwritten Traditions, fifteen hundred years was ſomewhat of the longeſt to have ſo conſiderable a part of the Rule of Faith concealed from the World; and who knows how much of it is concealed ſtill, for the Church has not told us, that ſhe has publiſhed all her unwritten Traditions; there may be a Neſt-egg left ſtill, which in time may add twelve new Articles to the *Trent*-Creed, as that has done to the Apoſtles Creed.

So that if the Scripture be an imperfect Rule of Faith, the Church never had a perfect Rule, till the Council of *Trent*; for a Rule which is not known, is none at all, and no body can tell whether our Rule be perfect yet: whether ſome more unwritten Traditions may not ſtart up in the next Age to make our Faith more perfect, than the Council of *Trent* it ſelf has made it. Now if the deſign of the Goſpel was to inſtruct men in all divine knowledge, can we think that our Saviour has given us ſuch an imperfect Rule, as needs to be ſupplied by unwritten Traditions in every Age? eſpecially when we conſider that ſome of the greateſt Myſteries and moſt uſeful Doctrines of the Chriſtian Religion, (if the Church of *Rome* be in the right) were not written, or ſo obſcurely, that no body could find them in the Scriptures, till they were diſcovered by the help of unwritten Traditions:

ditions; ſuch as the Supremacy of the Pope, the Infallibility of Popes and General Councils, the Worſhip of Images, the Invocation of Saints, and the great Glory and Prerogatives of the Virgin *Mary*, the Doctrine of Purgatory, Indulgences, the Sacrament of Penance, *&c.* as neceſſary Doctrines as any that are recorded in Scripture, and the denial of which makes us all Hereticks and Schiſmaticks, as the Church of *Rome* ſays. Though thanks be to God, as far as appears, we are no greater Hereticks and Schiſmaticks, than the Apoſtles were, unleſs they are excuſed for not knowing theſe neceſſary Articles of Faith, and we are Hereticks for denying them, ſince the Church of *Rome* in the Council of *Trent* has decreed and publiſhed them.

2. Theſe unwritten Traditions cannot ſupply the defects of a written Rule, becauſe they are of uncertain Authority, and therefore not the Objects, much leſs the Rule, of a certain Faith and Knowledge. What is not written, but ſaid to be delivered down from Age to Age by oral Tradition, and kept ſo privately, that the Church of God never heard of it for ſeveral hundred years, can never be proved but by Miracles, and they muſt be more credible Miracles too, than the School of the Euchariſt, and the Legends of the Saints furniſh us with; and yet I know of no better the Church of *Rome* has. It is impoſſible to prove, that a private Tradition cannot be corrupted; it is unreaſonable to think that any thing which concerns the neceſſary Articles of Faith or Rules of Worſhip, ſhould be a private and ſecret Tradition for ſeveral Ages. Miracles themſelves cannot prove any Tradition which is contrary to the written Rule, and the Catholick Faith of Chriſtians for ſeveral Ages, as ſeveral of the *Trent*-Doctrines are; nay, no Miracles can prove any new Article of Faith, which was never known before, without proving that Chriſt and his Apoſtles did not teach all things neceſſary to ſalvation; which will go a great way to overthrow the truth and certainty of the Chriſtian Faith: for Miracles themſelves can never prove, that Chriſt and his Apoſtles taught that which the Chriſtian Church never heard of before; which is either to prove that the whole World had forgot what they had been once taught, which I doubt

is

is not much for the credit of Tradition, or that the Church for ſeveral Ages did not teach all that Chriſt taught, which is no great reaſon to rely on the teachings of the Church; or to prove againſt matter of fact, that Chriſt and his Apoſtles taught that, which no body ever heard of, and I do not think a Miracle ſufficient to prove that true, which every body knows to be falſe, or at leaſt do not know it to be true, though they muſt have known it, if it had been true.

And does not every body now ſee, how improper unwritten Traditions are, to ſupply the Defects and Imperfections of the written Rule? for they can never make one Rule, becauſe they are not of equal Authority. A Writing may be proved Authentick, an obſcure unwritten Tradition cannot: and can any man think, that Chriſt would have one half of his Goſpel written, the other half unwritten, if he intended to perfect the knowledge of Chriſtians: for they cannot have ſo perfect a knowledge, becauſe they cannot have ſo great certainty, of the unwritten, as they have of the written Goſpel. Writing is the moſt certain Way to perpetuate Knowledge, and if Chriſt intended, that his Church in all Ages ſhould have a perfect Rule of Faith, we muſt acknowledge the perfection of the written Rule. The truth is, I cannot but admire the great artifice of the Church of *Rome*, in preaching up the Obſcurity and Imperfection of the Scriptures, for ſhe has hereby put it into her own power, to make Chriſtian Religion, what ſhe pleaſes; for if the Scriptures be obſcure, and ſhe alone can infallibly interpret them; if the Scriptures be imperfect, and ſhe alone can ſupply their defects by unwritten Traditions, it is plain, that Chriſtian Religion muſt be, what ſhe ſays it is, and it ſhall be, what her intereſt requires it to be. But whether this be conſiſtent with our Saviour's deſign in publiſhing the Goſpel, or whether it be the beſt way of improving the knowledge of Mankind, let any impartial man judge.

5*ly*. An Implicit Faith, or believing as the Church believes, without knowing what it is we believe, can be no Goſpel-Doctrine, becauſe this to be ſure cannot be for the improvement of knowledge.

ledge. Some of the Roman Doctors think it ſufficient, that a man believes as the Church believes, without an explicite knowledge of any thing they believe; but the general opinion is, that a man muſt have an explicite belief of the *Apoſtles Creed*, but as for every thing elſe it ſuffices, if he believes as the Church believes, without knowing, what the faith of the Church is: that is, it is not neceſſary men ſhould ſo much as know, what the new Articles of the *Trent* Faith are, if they believe the *Apoſtles Creed*, and reſign up their Faith implicitely to the Church.

Now this is a plain confeſſion, that all the Doctrines in diſpute between us and the *Church of Rome*, are of no uſe, much leſs neceſſary to ſalvation; for if they were, they would be as neceſſary to be known, and explicitely believed, as the *Apoſtles Creed*: and I cannot imagine, why we Hereticks, who believe the *Apoſtles Creed*, and underſtand it as orthodoxly as they, may not be ſaved without believing the new *Trent Creed*; for if we need not know what it is, there ſeems to be no need of believing it; for I always thought, that no man can, and therefore to be ſure no man need, believe, what he does not know. So that it ſeems, we know and believe all things, the explicite knowledge, and belief of which, by their own confeſſion, is neceſſary to ſalvation, except that one ſingle Point of the Infallibility of the *Church of Rome*: believe but that, and ye need believe or know nothing more but the *Apoſtles Creed*, and yet go to Heaven as a good *Catholick*: which makes an implicite Faith in the *Church of Rome*, as neceſſary as Faith in Chriſt is.

But if the intent of the Goſpel was to improve our Knowledge, then Chriſt never taught an implicite Faith, for that does not improve Knowledge: and if the Faith of the *Church of Rome*, excepting the *Apoſtles Creed*, which is the common Faith of all Chriſtians, need not be known, then they are no Goſpel-Doctrines, much leſs neceſſary Articles of Faith, for Chriſt taught nothing, but what he would have known; and though the knowledge of all things, which Chriſt taught, is not equally neceſſary to ſalvation, yet it tends to the perfecting our knowledge,

ledge, and Chriſt taught nothing which a man need not know; which I think is a reproach to meaner Maſters, and much more to the eternal and incarnate Wiſdom.

Secondly, The improvement and perfection of Humane Nature conſiſts in true Holineſs and Virtue, in a likeneſs and conformity to God, and a participation of the Divine Nature: and this is the great end of the Goſpel to advance us to as perfect Holineſs as is attainable in this life: Chriſt indeed has made expiation for our ſins by his own Bloud, but then this very Bloud of Atonement does not only expiate the guilt of ſin, but purges the Conſcience from dead works, that we may ſerve the living God: for no Sacrifice, not of the Son of God himſelf, can reconcile an impenitent and unreformed Sinner to God, that is, can move God to love a Sinner, who ſtill loves and continues in his ſins; which an infinitely holy and pure being cannot do: Indeed the expiation of ſin is but one part of the work of our Redemption; for a ſinner cannot be ſaved, that is, cannot be advanced to immortal life in the Kingdom of Heaven, without being born again, without being renewed and ſanctified by the holy Spirit, after the Image and likeneſs of God. For this new Nature is the only Principle of a new immortal life in us; an earthly ſenſual mind is no more capable of living in Heaven, than an earthly mortal body. In both ſenſes *fleſh and bloud cannot inherit the Kingdom of God, neither can corruption inherit incorruption.*

The Church of *Rome* indeed has taken great care about the firſt of theſe, and has found out more ways of expiating ſin, and making ſatisfaction for it, than the Goſpel ever taught us; whether they are ſo effectual to this purpoſe, let thoſe look to it, who truſt in them: but there is not that care taken to inculcate the neceſſity of internal holineſs and purity of mind, and one would eaſily gueſs there can be no great need of it in that Church, which has ſo many eaſie ways of expiating ſin.

The true character of Goſpel-Doctrines is, a Doctrine according to Godlineſs, the principal deſign of which is to promote true goodneſs; all the Articles of the Chriſtian Faith tend to this end, to lay great and irreſiſtible obligations on us to abſtain from

every sin, and to exercise our selves in every thing that is good, as we have ability and opportunity to do it: and therefore all Doctrines which secretly undermine a good life, and make it unnecessary for men to be truly and sincerely vertuous, can be no Gospel-Doctrines. That there are such Doctrines in the *Church of Rome*, has been abundantly proved by the late Learned and Reverend Bishop *Taylor* in his *Dissuasive from Popery*; which is so very useful a Book, that I had rather direct my Readers to it, than transcribe out of it: My design leads me to another method; for if I can prove that the Doctrines and Practices of the *Church of Rome* naturally tend to evacuate the force of the Gospel it self, to make men good and holy; every one will easily see that that can be no Gospel-Faith and Worship, which sets aside the Gospel it self.

The whole Doctrine of the Gospel either consists of the Rules of Holiness, or of the Motives and Instruments of it; for the Articles of the Christian Faith are all of them so many Motives to a good life: let us then consider how the Faith and Worship of the *Church of Rome* has made void the Gospel of our Saviour, as the *Pharisees* made void the Law of *Moses* by their Traditions.

1. Let us begin then with the Gospel-Rules of Holiness. It would be an endless thing here to take notice of the loose Determinations of their famed and approved *Casuists*, of their Doctrine of probable Opinions, of the direction of the intention, by which means the very Laws and Boundaries of Vertue and Vice are in a great measure quite altered; and it may be this would only make work for the *Representer*, and furnish out a fourth part of the *Papist Misrepresented*, if we venture to tell the World what has been the avowed Doctrines of their great Divines and *Casuists*. But whether such Definitions be the Doctrine of their Church or not, I am sure they are equally mischievous, if they be the Doctrines of their Confessors who have the immediate direction of mens Consciences. Those who have a mind to be satisfied in this matter, may find enough of it in the *Provincial Letters*, the *Jesuits Morals*, and Bishop *Taylor*'s *Dissuasive*. It sufficiently answers my present design to take notice of some few plain things, which will admit of no dispute.

I

I have already shewn what a great value the *Church of Rome* sets upon an external Righteousness, which is much more meritorious than a real and substantial Piety and Virtue. Now let any man judge whether this be not apt to corrupt mens notions of what is good; to perswade them that such external observances are much more pleasing to God, and therefore certainly much better in themselves, than true Gospel-Obedience, than Moral and Evangelical Vertues; for that which will merit of God the pardon of the greatest immoralities, and a great reward, that which supplies the want of true Vertue, which compensates for sin, and makes men great Saints, must needs be more pleasing to God, than Vertue it self is: and if men can believe this, all the Laws of Holiness signifie nothing, but to let men know, when they break them, that they may make satisfaction by some meritorious Superstitions.

Thus the Doctrine of venial sins, which are hardly any sins at all, to be sure how numerous soever they are, or how frequently soever repeated, cannot deserve eternal punishments, is apt to give men very slight thoughts of very great Evils: For very great Evils may come under the notion of venial sins, when they are the effects of Passion and Surprize, and the like. Indeed this very Doctrine of venial sins is so perplexed and undermined, that the Priest and the Penitent may serve themselves of it to good purpose: I am sure this distinction is apt to make men careless of what they think little faults, which are generally the seeds and dispositions to much greater; such as the sudden eruptions of Passion, some wanton thoughts, an *indecorum* and undecency in words and actions, and what men will please to call little venial sins, for there is no certain Rule to know them by: so that while this distinction lasts, men have an excuse at hand for a great many sins, which they need take no care of; they are not obliged to aim at those perfections of Vertue, which the Gospel requires; if they keep clear of mortal sins, they are safe, and that men may do, without any great attainments in Vertue; which does not look very like a Gospel-Doctrine, which gives us such admirable Laws, which requires such great circumspection

in our Lives, ſuch a command over our Paſſions, ſuch inoffenſiveneſs in our Words and Actions, as no Inſtitution in the World ever did before. Whatever corrupt mens Notions of Good and Evil, as External Superſtitions, and the diſtinction between Venial and Mortal Sins is apt to do, is a contradiction to the deſign of the Goſpel, to give us the plain Rules and Precepts of a perfect Vertue.

Secondly. Let us conſider ſome of the principal Motives of the Goſpel to a Holy Life, and ſee, whether the *Church of Rome* does not evacuate them alſo, and deſtroy their force and power.

Now 1. The Fundamental Motive of all, is the abſolute neceſſity of a Holy Life; that *without holineſs no man ſhall ſee God*, for no other Argument has any neceſſary force without this. But the abſolute neceſſity of a holy life to pleaſe God, and to go to Heaven, is many ways overthrown by the *Church of Rome*, and nothing would more effectually overthrow the *Church of Rome*, than to re-eſtabliſh this Doctrine of the abſolute neceſſity of a good life. For were men once convinced of this, that there is no way to get to Heaven, but by being truly and ſincerely good; they would keep their Money in their Pockets, and not fling it ſo laviſhly away up Indulgencies, or Maſſes; they would ſtay at home, and not tire themſelves with fruitleſs Pilgrimages, and prodigal Offerings at the Shrines of ſome powerful Saints, all external, troubleſome and coſtly Superſtitions would fall into contempt; good men would feel, that they need them not, and if bad men were convinced, that they would do them no good, there were an end of them, for the only uſe of them is to excuſe men from the neceſſity of being good.

But this is moſt evident in their Doctrine about the Sacrament of Penance, that bare Contrition with the Abſolution of the Prieſt, puts a man into a ſtate of Salvation; I do not lay it upon Attrition, which is ſomewhat leſs than Contrition, though the *Council of Trent*, if I can underſtand plain words, makes that ſufficient with the Abſolution of the Prieſt; but becauſe ſome men will unreaſonably wrangle about this, I ſhall inſiſt only on what

what is acknowledged by themſelves, that Contrition, which is only a ſorrow for ſin, if we confeſs our ſins to a Prieſt, and receive abſolution, puts us into a ſtate of Grace: now contrition, or ſorrow for ſin, is not a holy life, and therefore this Doctrine overthrows the neceſſity of a holy life, becauſe men may be ſaved by the Sacrament of Penance without it, and then I know no neceſſity there is of mortifying their Luſts: for if they ſin again, it is only repeating the ſame remedy, confeſſing their ſins; and being ſorry for them, and receiving abſolution, and they are reſtored to the favour of God, and to a ſtate of ſalvation again. Nay, ſome of their Caſuiſts tell us, that God has not commanded men to repent, but only at the time of death, and then contrition with abſolution will ſecure their ſalvation, after a whole life ſpent in wickedneſs, without any other good action, but only ſorrow for ſin: and if men are not bound by the Laws of God ſo much as to be contrite for their ſins, till they find themſelves dying, and uncapable of doing any good, all men muſt grant, that a holy life is not neceſſary to ſalvation.

2. More particularly. The love of God in giving his own Son to die for us, and the love of Chriſt in giving himſelf for us, are great Goſpel Motives to Obedience and a Holy Life; but theſe can only work upon ingenuous minds, who have already in ſome meaſure conquered the love of ſin; for where the love of ſin prevails, it is too powerful for the love of God; but the holineſs and purity and inflexible juſtice of the Divine Nature is a very good argument, becauſe it enforces the neceſſity of a holy life; for a holy God cannot be reconciled to wicked Men; will not forgive our ſins, unleſs we repent of them, and reform them: which muſt engage all men, who hope for pardon and forgiveneſs from God, to forſake their ſins, and reform their lives: but the force of this Argument is loſt in the *Church of Rome* by the judicial abſolution of the Prieſt: for they ſee daily the Prieſt does abſolve them without forſaking their ſins, and God muſt confirm the ſentence of his Miniſters, and therefore they are abſolved, and need not fear, that God will not abſolve them, when the Prieſt has; which muſt either deſtroy all ſence of God's

eſſential

eſſential holineſs and purity, and perſwade them, that God can be reconciled to ſinners, while they continue in their ſins, or elſe, they muſt believe, that God has given power to his Prieſts, to abſolve thoſe, whom he could not have abſolved himſelf: To be ſure it is in vain to tell men, that God will not forgive ſinners, while they continue in their ſins, if they believe the judicial authority of the Prieſt to forgive ſins; for they every day abſolve men, who do not forſake their ſins, and if their abſolution be good, God muſt forgive them too; and thus the holineſs and inflexible juſtice of God loſes its force upon good Catholicks to reform their lives; and therefore were there no other arguments againſt it, it is not likely that the judicial abſolution of the Prieſt, as it is taught and practiſed in the *Church of Rome*, ſhould be a Goſpel-Doctrine.

3. The Death and Sacrifice of Chriſt is another Goſpel-Motive to Holineſs of Life; not only becauſe he has now bought us with his own Blood, and therefore we muſt no longer live unto our ſelves, but to him, who died for us; but becauſe his Blood is the Blood of the Covenant, and the efficacy of his Sacrifice extends no farther than the Goſpel-Covenant, which *teaches us to deny all ungodlineſs and worldly luſts, and to live ſoberly, righteouſly, and godly in this preſent world.* That is, no man can be ſaved by the Blood of Chriſt, but thoſe who obey the Goſpel, which obliges all men, who hope to be ſaved by Chriſt, to the practiſe of an univerſal righteouſneſs.

This the *Church of Rome* ſeems very ſenſible of, that none but ſincere Penitents, and truly good men can be ſaved by the Sacrifice of Chriſt upon the Croſs; which gives no hope to Sinners, who do not repent of their ſins and amend their lives; and therefore ſhe has found out a great many other ways of expiating Sin, which give more comfort to Sinners. The Sacrifice of the Maſs has a diſtinct vertue and merit from the Sacrifice upon the Croſs; it is a propitiatory Sacrifice for the living and the dead, to expiate eſpecially the ſins of thoſe, for whom it is particularly offered; and thus thoſe ſins which are not expiated by the Death of Chriſt upon the Croſs, are expiated by the Sacrifice of the

the Maſs, and that by the bear *opus operatum*, by the offering this Sacrifice of the Maſs itſelf, without any good motion in the perſon for whom it is offered: and thus the Sacrifice of the Maſs deſtroys the vertue of Chriſt's Sacrifice upon the Croſs, to oblige men to holineſs of life; for though none but ſincere and reformed Penitents are pardoned by the Sacrifice of the Croſs, the Sacrifice of the Maſs will expiate the ſins of unreformed Sinners, and then there is no need to reform our lives. Thus I am ſure all men underſtand it, or they would never put their confidence in the Maſs-Sacrifice; for if it does no more for us than Chriſt's Death upon the Croſs, it might be ſpared, for it gives no new comforts to impenitent Sinners.

They are very ſenſible, that holineſs of life is neceſſary to intitle us to the Pardon and Forgiveneſs purchaſed by the Death of Chriſt; but then the Sacrifice of the Maſs, Humane Penances, and Satisfactions, and Merits, and Indulgences, ſeem on purpoſe contrived to ſupply the place of Holineſs of Life; for no body can imagine elſe what they are good for. Chriſt has by his Death upon the Croſs, made a perfect Atonement for the ſins of all true penitent and reformed Sinners; and therefore a true Penitent, who according to the terms of the Goſpel, *denies all ungodlineſs and worldly luſts, and lives ſoberly, righteouſly, and godly in this preſent world*, needs no Expiation but the Death of Chriſt: Will they deny this? by no means! They grant, that all our ſins are done away in Baptiſm, meerly by the application of Chriſt's Death and Paſſion to us; and therefore the Death of Chriſt is a complete and perfect ſatisfaction for all Sin, or elſe Baptiſm, which derives its whole vertue from the Death of Chriſt, could not waſh away all ſin: What uſe can there be then of the new propitiatory Sacrifice of the Maſs, of humane Satisfactions, and Merits, and Indulgences? Truly none but this, that when our ſins are expiated by the Death of Chriſt, and the pardon of all our ſins applied to us in Baptiſm, the Goſpel exacts a holy life from us, and therefore men forfeit the baptiſmal Pardon of their ſins by the Bloud of Chriſt, unleſs they either live very holy lives, or make ſome other ſatisfaction for their not doing ſo: And for this purpoſe

the

the Sacrifice of the Maſs, humane Penances, and Satisfactions ſerve. It will not be unuſeful, nor unpleaſant to draw a ſhort Scheme of this whole matter, which will explain this great Myſtery, and make it intelligible, which now appears to be nothing but nonſence and confuſion.

Chriſt then has made a perfect Atonement and Expiation for ſin; this is applied to us at Baptiſm, wherein all our ſins are forgiven; and while we continue in this ſtate of Grace, we cannot be eternally damned, though we may be puniſhed for our ſins, both in this World and Purgatory. But every mortal ſin puts us out of the ſtate of Grace, which we were in by Baptiſm, and till we be reſtored to the ſtate of Grace again, we muſt be eternally damned, becauſe we have no right to the Sacrifice and Expiation of Chriſt's Death: the only way in the *Church of Rome*, to reſtore us to this ſtate of Grace, is by the Sacrament of Penance, and the Abſolution of the Prieſt, which reſtores us to the ſame ſtate which Baptiſm at firſt put us into, and therefore very well deſerves to be thought a Sacrament: And thus we recover our intereſt in the Merits of Chriſt's Death, and therefore cannot be eternally damned for our ſins; but ſtill it is our duty to live well, for the Death of Chriſt does not excuſe us from Holineſs of Life, which is the condition of the Goſpel; and therefore if we are in a ſtate of Grace, and thereby ſecured from eternal damnation, yet if we live in ſin we muſt be puniſhed for it, unleſs we can find ſome other expiation for ſin, than the Death of Chriſt upon the Croſs, which ſtill leaves us under the obligations of a holy life, and therefore cannot make ſuch an Expiation for ſin, as ſhall ſerve inſtead of a holy life: Now here comes in the Sacrifice of the Mas, Humane Penance, Satisfactions, Indulgencies;

For the ſacrifice of the Maſs, as I obſerved before, does not ſerve the ſame end, that the Sacrifice of the Croſs does: the Sacrifice of the Maſs is a propitiatory Sacrifice for the living and the dead; But what ſins is it a Propitiation for? For ſuch ſins for which men are to ſatisfie themſelves; that is, for all ſins the eternal puniſhment of which is remitted for the Sacrifice of the Croſs. This is evident from their making the Sacrifice of the Maſs

Maſs a propitiatory Sacrifice for the dead; that is, for the Souls in Purgatory, who ſuffer there the temporal puniſhments of ſin, when the eternal puniſhment is forgiven: the Souls in Hell are capable of no Expiation, and therefore an expiatory Sacrifice for the dead, can be only for the Souls in Purgatory, and that is for the temporal puniſhment of ſin, for which the Sacrifice of the Croſs is no Expiation; and the Maſs is in no other ſence made a Sacrifice for the living than for the dead; and therefore is not to expiate the eternal, but the temporal puniſhments of ſin, as appears from hence, that the ſaying Maſſes, or hearing Maſſes, or purchaſing Maſſes, is reckoned among thoſe Penances men muſt do for the Expiation of their ſins, and yet they can, by all they do, only expiate for the temporal puniſhment of ſin; and therefore Maſſes for the living are only for the Expiation of thoſe temporal puniſhments of ſin, for which the Sacrifice of the Croſs made no Expiation. And I ſhall be ſo civil at preſent, as not to inquire, how the Sacrifice of the Croſs, and the Sacrifice of the Maſs, which are the very ſame Sacrifice of the Natural Body and Bloud of Chriſt, come to ſerve ſuch very different ends: that when Chriſt was Sacrificed upon the Croſs he expiated only for the eternal puniſhment of ſin; when Sacrificed in the Maſs, only for the temporal. I need add nothing to prove, that Humane Penances, Satisfactions, Merits, Indulgencies, are onely to expiate temporal puniſhment of ſin, becauſe it is univerſally acknowledged. Now if theſe temporal puniſhments be only in lieu of Holineſs and Obedience which the Goſpel requires to intitle us to the Expiation of Chriſt's Death upon the Croſs, as I have already ſhewn; then it is evident to a demonſtration, that the *Church of Rome* has overthrown the Death and Sacrifice of Chriſt upon the Croſs, conſider'd as an argument of a holy life, by ſetting up the Sacrifice of the Maſs, Humane Penances, Satisfactions, Merits, Indulgencies, inſtead of the Goſpel-terms of obedience and holineſs of life.

4. The Interceſſion of Chriſt for us, at the right hand of God, is another powerful motive to Holineſs of Life: It gives all the encouragement to true penitent Sinners, that can be deſired: For *if any man ſin, we have an advocate with the Father Jeſus Chriſt* 1 John 2. 2.

the righteous, who is also a propitiation for our sins. But then Christ mediates only in vertue of his Bloud, that is, only upon the terms and conditions of the Covenant of Grace which was sealed by his Bloud; that is, he mediates and intercedes only for true penitent sinners; which obliges us, as we hope to be heard by God, when we pray in the Name of Christ, truly and heartily to repent of all our sins, and to live a new life.

This the *Church of Rome* also seems very sensible of, that Christ of his own accord will not intercede for impenitent and unreformed sinners; that he who is the great Example and the great Preacher of Righteousness, will not espouse the Cause of incorrigible sinners, who are very desirous of pardon, but hate to be reformed; and therefore they seem to think it as hopeless a thing to go immediately to a holy Jesus, as to appear before the Tribunal of a just and righteous God, without a powerful Advocate.

For this reason they have found out a great many other Advocates and Mediators a great deal more pitiful and compassionate than Christ is, who by their interest in him, or their great favour with God, may obtain that pardon which otherwise they could not hope for; such as the Virgin *Mary*, who is the Mother of Christ, and therefore, as they presume, has as great interest in and authority over him, as a Mother has over her Son; besides those vast numbers of meritorious Saints, whose Intercessions cannot but prevail for those sinners whose Cause they undertake.

And that this is the true reason of their Addresses to Saints and the Virgin *Mary*, though they will not speak out, is evident to any considering man: For will they say, that Christ, who became man for us, who suffered and died for us, who was in all things tempted like as we are, yet without sin; who did and suffered all this on purpose that he might be a merciful and compassionate High Priest, and might give us the highest assurance of his tenderness and compassion for us. I say, can they suspect that such a High Priest will not undertake to plead our Cause, if we be such as according to the terms of the Gospel, it is his Office to interceed for? No Christian dare say this, which is such a reproach to our common Saviour, who hath bought us with his

own

own Bloud; and therefore no Christian who thinks himself within the reach and compass of Christ's Intercession, can need or desire any other Advocate: but those who are conscious to themselves of so much wickedness, that they cannot hope the holy Jesus will intercede for them for their own sakes, have reason to procure some other Favourites to intercede for them with their Intercessor; and to countenance the matter they must recommend it to the practice of all Christians, and more than so, make it Heresie to deny it. There is but one Argument I know of against this, that any man should be so stupid as to think that the Intercession of the Virgin *Mary*, or the most powerful Saints, can prevail with our Saviour to do that, which according to the Laws of his own Mediation, they know he cannot and will not do: and this I confess I cannot answer, but yet so it is. And thus the Intercession of Christ is made a very ineffectual Argument to make men good; for though Christ will intercede for none but true Penitents, the *Church of Rome* has a great many other Advocates that will, or at least she perswades people that they will.

5. Another great Gospel-Motive to a holy life, is the hope of Heaven, and the fear of Hell. As for the hope of Heaven, that is no otherwise a Motive to holiness of life, but upon a supposition of the necessity of Holiness, that *without holiness no man shall see God*; but this you have already heard, is overthrown by the *Church of Rome*: and if men may go to Heaven without holiness, I know no need of it for that purpose in this World.

But Hell is a very terrible thing, to be condemned to endless and eternal torments with the Devil and his Angels; but then the Doctrine of Purgatory does mightily abate and take off this terror: for though Purgatory be a terrible place too, not cooler than Hell it self, yet it is not eternal; and men, who are mightily in love with their sins, will venture temporal punishments, though somewhat of the longest, to enjoy their present satisfactions: especially considering how many easie ways there are for rich men to get out of Purgatory; those who have money enough to buy Indulgences while they live, and Masses for their

Souls when they die, need not lie long there, if the Prieſts are not out in their reckoning: and yet it is ſo eaſie a thing for a good Catholick to get into Purgatory; eſpecially if he take care frequently to confeſs himſelf, and receive abſolution, or do not die ſo ſuddenly as to be ſurprized in any mortal ſin, that Hell ſeems to be very little thought of, or feared in the *Church of Rome*. Now I deſire no better Argument, that all theſe are not Goſpel-Doctrines, than that they deſtroy the force of all thoſe Arguments the Goſpel uſes to make men good; that is, they are a direct contradiction to the Goſpel of Chriſt.

6. I ſhall name but one Motive more, and that is the Exam-
12 Heb. 1. ples of good men; *To be followers of them, who through faith and patience inherit the promiſes*; that *being incompaſſed with ſuch a cloud of witneſſes, we ſhould lay aſide every weight, and the ſin which doth ſo eaſily beſet us, and run with patience the race which is ſet before us*. Now this is a powerful Argument, becauſe they were men as we are, ſubject to the ſame temptations and infirmities; and therefore their Examples prove, that Holineſs is a practicable thing; that it is poſſible for men to conquer all the difficulties of Religion, and all the temptations in this life; and many times in them we ſee the viſible rewards of Vertue in great peace of mind, great aſſurances of the divine favour, great ſupports under all adverſities, and ſuch a triumphant death, as is a bleſſed preſage of a glorious Reſurrection.

But now in the *Church of Rome*, if there be any great and meritorious Saints, as they call them, their extraordinary Vertues are not ſo much for Imitation as for a ſtock of Merits. The more Saints they have, the leſs reaſon other men have to be Saints, if they have no mind to it, becauſe there is a greater treaſury of Merits in the Church to relieve thoſe who have none of their own. The extraordinary Devotion of their Monaſteries and Nunneries, (for ſo they would perſwade the World, that there is nothing but Devotion there) is not for Imitation, and it is unreaſonable it ſhould, becauſe no body ſees it; and it is impoſſible to imitate that recluſe life, without turning the whole World into a Monaſtery: but theſe Religious Societies furniſh the

the Church with a ſtock of Merits, out of which ſhe grants Indulgencies to thoſe, who are not very religious; and it is plain, that if one man can merit for twenty, there is no need, there ſhould be above one in twenty good. Herein indeed the Members of the *Church of Rome*, have the advantage of all other Churches, (eſpecially if they enter themſelves into any religious Confraternity, to partake in the Merits of the Society) that others can merit for them; and then if we can ſhare in the Merits of the Saints, we need not imitate them: a Church which has Saints to merit for them on Earth, and to intercede for them in Heaven, if ſhe can but maintain and propagate a Race of ſuch meriting Saints, (which is taken care of in the Inſtitution and Encouragement of Monaſtick Orders and Fraternities) may be very indulgent to the reſt of her Members, who do not like meriting themſelves. So that the principal Motives of the Goſpel to Holy Life, as appears in theſe Six Particulars, loſe their force and efficacy in the *Church of Rome*, and certainly thoſe cannot be Goſpel-Doctrines, which deſtroy the great end of the Goſpel to make men Good.

3*ly*, Nor do the Goſpel-means and Inſtruments of Holineſs and Vertue eſcape better in the *Church of Rome*: as will appear in a very few words.

Reading and Meditating on the Holy Scriptures, is one excellent means of Grace, not only as it informs us of our Duty, but as it keeps a conſtant warm ſenſe of it upon our Minds, which nothing can ſo effectually do, as a daily reading of the Scripture, which ſtrikes the mind with a more ſacred authority, than any Humane Diſcourſes can do: but this is denied to the People of the *Church of Rome*, who are not allowed to read the Scriptures in the Vulgar Tongue, for fear of Hereſie, which, it ſeems, is more plain and obvious in the Scripture than Catholick Doctrines: but they ſhould alſo have conſidered, whether the danger of Hereſie or Sin be the greater; whether an orthodox faith or a good life be more valuable; and if denying the people the uſe of the Bible be the way to keep them orthodox, I am ſure it is not the way to make them good; True Piety will loſe more by this, than the Faith will get by it.

Thus,

Thus conſtant and fervent Prayer, beſides that ſupernatural grace and aſſiſtance it obtains for us, is an excellent moral inſtrument of holineſs: for when men confeſs their ſins to God with ſhame and ſorrow, when with inflamed Devotions, they beg the aſſiſtances of the Divine Grace, when their ſouls are every day poſſeſſed with ſuch a great ſence awe and reverence for God, as he muſt have, who prays devoutly to him every day; I ſay, it is impoſſible ſuch men ſhould eaſily return to thoſe ſins, which they have ſo lately confeſſed, with ſuch ſhame and confuſion and bitter remorſe; that thoſe who ſo importunately beg the aſſiſtance of the Divine Grace, ſhould not uſe their beſt endeavours to reſiſt Temptations, and to improve in Grace and Vertue, which is a prophane mockery of God, to beg his aſſiſtance, that he will work in us, and with us, when we will not work: that thoſe who have a conſtant ſence and reverence of God, ſhould do ſuch things, as argue, that men have no fear of God before their eyes.

But this is all loſt in the *Church of Rome*, where men are taught to Pray they know not what, and when men do not underſtand their Prayers, it is certain ſuch Prayers cannot affect their minds, what other good ſoever *Latin* Prayers may do them; and thus one of the moſt powerful Inſtruments of Piety and Vertue is quite ſpoiled by Prayers in an unknown Tongue, which can no more improve their Vertue than their Knowledge.

Sorrow for Sin is an excellent Inſtrument of true Repentance, as that ſignifies the reformation of our Lives; for the natural effect of Sorrow is, not to do that again, which we are ſorry for doing; but in the *Church of Rome*, this contrition, or ſorrow for ſin, ſerves only to qualifie men for abſolution, and that puts them into a ſtate of grace, and then they may expiate their ſins by Penances, but are under no neceſſity of forſaking them.

The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, beſides thoſe ſupernatural conveyances of Grace, which are annexed to it, by our Saviour's Inſtitution, is a great Moral Inſtrument of Holineſs; it repreſenting to us the Love of our crucified Lord, the Merit and Deſert of Sin, the Vertue of his Sacrifice to expiate our Sins, and

to

to purge our Consciences from Dead Works, and requiring the exercise of a great many Vertues; an abhorrence and detestation of our Sins, great and ardent Passions of Love and Devotion, firm Resolutions of Living to him, who Died for us, Forgiveness of Enemies, and an Universal Love and Charity to all Men, especially to the Members of the same Body with us; but in the *Church of Rome* this admirable Sacrament is turned into a dumb shew, which no body can be edified with, or into a Sacrifice for the living and the dead, which expiates Sin, and serves us instead of a Holy Life, as I observed above.

External Mortifications, and Severities to the Body, Fastings, Watchings, hard Lodging, *&c.* are very useful Instruments of Vertue, when they are intended to subdue the Flesh to the Spirit, and to wean our Minds from Sensual Enjoyments; but when they are intended to satisfie for our Sins, not to kill them; to punish our selves for our sins, that we may commit them more securely again, this is not a means to break vicious Habits, and to conquer the love of Sin, but only to conquer the fear of committing it.

This is enough to shew, how far Popery is from promoting the great design of the Gospel to improve and perfect Humane Nature and Holiness, and were there no other Argument against it, this were sufficient to me to prove, That it cannot be the Religion of the Gospel of Christ.

FINIS.

ERRATA.

PAge 27. line 10. for *great*, read *greater*. p. 37. l. 5. f. *when*, r. *where*. l. 23. f. *contract*, r. *contact*. p. 40. l. 27. f. *should it*, r. *it should*. p. 79. l. 22. f. *undermined*, r. *undetermined*. p. 80. l. 3. f. *corrupt*, r. *corrupts*. l. 22. f. *up*, r. *upon*. p. 91. l. 22. r. *in knowledge and holiness*.

Books lately Printed for W. Rogers.

THE Doctrines and Practices of the Church of *Rome*, truly Repreſented; in Anſwer to a Book, intituled, *A Papiſt Miſrepreſented, and Repreſented*, &c. Quarto.

An Anſwer to a Diſcourſe, intituled, *Papiſts proteſting againſt Proteſtant Popery*. Quarto.

An Anſwer to the *Amicable Accommodation*. Quarto.

A View of the whole Controverſie, between the *Repreſenter* and the *Anſwerer*. Quarto.

The Doctrine of the *Trinity*, and *Tranſubſtantiation*, compared as to *Scripture*, *Reaſon*, and *Tradition*; 1*ſt* and 2*d* Part. In two Dialogues, between a Proteſtant and a Papiſt. Quarto.

An Anſwer to the Eighth *Chapter* of the *Repreſenter's* Second Part.

Of the Authority of *Councils*, and the Rule of *Faith*. By a Perſon of Quality: With an Anſwer to the Eight *Theſes*, laid down for the Tryal of the *Engliſh Reformation*.

Sermons and Diſcourſes: The Third Volume. By Dr. *Tillotſon*, Dean of *Canterbury*. 8°.

A Manual for a *Chriſtian* Souldier, Written by *Eraſmus*.

A new and eaſie Method to learn to *Sing* by Book.

A Book of Cyphers, or Letters Reverſt: Price bound 5 *s*.

A Perſwaſive to frequent Communion in the *Sacrament* of the *Lord's Supper*. By Dr. *Tillotſon*, Dean of *Canterbury*. In Octavo. Price 3 *d*.

A Diſcourſe againſt *Tranſubſtantiation*. In Octavo. Price 3 *d*.

The State of the Church of *Rome* when the Reformation began.

A Letter to a Friend, Reflecting on ſome Paſſages in a Letter to the D. of *P.* in Anſwer to the Arguing Part of his firſt Letter to Mr. *G.*

The *Reflecter's* Defence of his Letter to a Friend: In Four Dialogues.

A Diſcourſe concerning the Nature of Idolatry: in which the Biſhop of *Oxford's* true and only Notion of Idolatry is Conſidered and Confuted.

The Proteſtant Reſolv'd: or, a Diſcourſe, ſhewing the Unreaſonableneſs of his Turning Roman Catholick *for Salvation*. Second Edition.

The Abſolute Impoſſibility of *Tranſubſtantiation* Demonſtrated.

A Sermon Preached at the Funeral of the Reverend *Benj. Calamy*, D.D.

A Vindication of ſome Proteſtant Principles of Church-Unity and Catholick-Communion, from the Charge of Agreement with the Church of *Rome*. In Anſwer to a late Pamphlet, Intituled, *An Agreement between the Church of* England *and the Church of* Rome, *evinced from the Concertation of ſome of her Sons with their Brethren the Diſſenters*.

A Preſervative againſt *Popery*; being ſome Plain Directions to Unlearned *Proteſtants*, how to Diſpute with *Romiſh* Prieſts. The Firſt Part. The Fourth Edition.

These three laſt by *William Sherlock*, D.D. Maſter of the *Temple*.

Imprimatur Liber cui Titulus,

A Vindication of both Parts of the Professor, &c. against Popery, &c.

Guil. Nicholson R. R.
in Christo P. ac D. D.
Wilhelmo Archiepisc.
Cant. à Sacr. Domest.

Aug. 4. 1688.